IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Digital Repository

Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations

1975

The effect of teacher home visits on parental, faculty and student attitudes within a selected Iowa school district

John Milton Barron
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd

 Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Barron, John Milton, "The effect of teacher home visits on parental, faculty and student attitudes within a selected Iowa school district " (1975). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 5404.
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/5404

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-25,316

BARRON, John Milton, 1939-
THE EFFECT OF TEACHER HOME VISITS ON PARENTAL, FACULTY AND STUDENT ATTITUDES WITHIN A SELECTED IOWA SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1975
Education, general

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

The effect of teacher home visits on parental, faculty and student attitudes within a selected Iowa school district

by

John Milton Barron

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

In a country with a very mobile and growing population we also find a society whose citizens have become more impersonal towards their fellow man. In times not long past a person knew everyone in his or her own community and was, in turn, known by them. The growth of our country from village to metropolis was summarized by Lichtman (39) when he stated:

> The United States has progressed from a nation of villages in which everyone knew everyone else to a nation of large urban areas where people give only a nod of acknowledgement to next door neighbors.

Information was often generated, accumulated and dispersed in a variety of settings. Frequently the school served as a center for much of the community and opinions on a variety of topics were exchanged between parents and teachers.

With the decline of many small towns and with the movement of families to suburbs much of the "mirror" or "life in a glass house" atmosphere succumbed. Whatever the reason for the demise of the closeness and camaraderie of this intimate awareness, there was also an effect on the home-school relationship. As a result of various growth patterns our society has changed and brought new complexities.

In the past, a certain closeness between home and school existed because of the high esteem held by parents for the teacher. It was not uncommon for a teacher to cummunicate a message to a parent, via the student, or directly to the parent at the market, the church or occasionally the home. The converse of the situation was also true.

As stated by Kornegay (35):

> ...in many communities in the United States, the teacher retains his position second only to the minister and each family likes to look its best.

As a result of these informal teacher home visits, parents could obtain information about the school and the progress of their child in a way that was not offered by standard reporting forms and methods. Thus the parent and teacher shared a rapport between home and school through the bond of the child.

As schools increased in enrollment much of the personalized attention given to home visits was curtailed or abandoned due to the limitations of time, distance, number of students, increased social pressures and often the anonymity that many individuals desire. Many parents knew little of the school's activities, curriculum and educational issues, and the parents and teachers knew little of each other.

Research conducted into the merit of teacher home visits has been limited. Generally the literature which has appeared has been anecdotal, brief, dated and without statistical support. It is for these reasons that the researcher determined a need for a study to evaluate the merit of teacher home visits.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were to determine:

1. Attitudes of selected groups toward teacher home visits.
2. Attitudes of selected groups toward other educational issues.
3. Correlation between attitudes of selected groups toward teacher home visits and other educational issues.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the investigation was to ascertain existing attitudes toward teacher home visits and other related educational issues among the following groups:

1. Parents with students currently enrolled in a public high school.
2. Teachers and administrators.
3. Students.
4. Parents who had children graduate from a public high school in 1972 but who had no children in a public junior or senior high school at the time of this study.
5. Parents of students currently enrolled in ninth grade but who did not have a student graduate in 1972 or a student currently enrolled in a public high school.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for the successful completion of this investigation:

1. All teachers and administrators completed the instrument accurately before and after the home visits occurred.
2. All parents completed the instrument accurately either before or after the home visits occurred.
3. All students in the study answered the instrument accurately.
4. The respondents understood the meaning of the terms and the language used.
5. Measures were valid for the purposes intended.

Delimitations of the Study

Data for this investigation were limited to the opinions of five sources:

1. Faculty and administration of a public high school.
2. Parents of students enrolled in a public high school.
3. Parents who had students graduate in the previous academic year but who do not currently have students in high school or in junior high school.
4. Parents who have students enrolled in the ninth grade but do not have students currently in high school or one who graduated in 1972.
5. Students currently enrolled at a public high school of either sophomore, junior or senior classification.

The study was limited to faculty, administrators, parents, and students and was conducted from August 1972 through December 1972. No other groups from the community, schools, or student bodies were considered.

Sources of Data

For the purpose of this investigation, a survey was conducted of the opinions of parents, faculty, and students of a progressive innovative school system in Iowa. The respondents were asked their opinions of teacher home visits and their opinions on other educational issues. Information for this investigation was obtained by use of questionnaire which was mailed to parents and hand-delivered to faculty and students.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses have been made for this investigation:

NH1: There is no significant difference among various groups in their opinions toward education as measured by the Education Scale.

NH2: There is no significant difference in opinion among various groups on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

NH3: There is no significant difference among various groups in opinion as measured by the semantic differential toward the following concepts:

A. A public high school
B. Students at a public high school
C. Education in America
D. Parents of public high school students
E. Teacher-home visits
F. Teachers at a public high school.

NH4: There is no significant difference in opinion between teacher groups as measured by the Education Scale on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, or as measured by the semantic differential when the demographic variables of sex, age, degree and experience are considered.

NH5: There is no significant difference in opinion between student groups as measured by the Education Scale on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, or as measured by the semantic differential when the demographic variables of sex and class are considered.

This dissertation is comprised of five chapters of which chapter one is the introduction to the investigation. Chapter two consists of the review of literature. The methods and procedures utilized in this study are included in chapter three. Descriptive and inferential treatments of the data are presented in chapter four, the findings. The fifth and final chapter provides a discussion of the meaningful findings and includes a summary, conclusions and recommendations.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The investigation into the literature concerning teacher home visits revealed that little research has been conducted in the area. Research was found to be minimal and most supportive literature was anecdotal and reported the result of an individual teacher visiting a particular student home.

Sources open to the investigator were researched which included periodicals, journals, abstracts, books, ERIC microfiche, Datrix (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan) and public records.

School and home contact and cooperation in the United States have traditionally been greater in the elementary schools as compared with the secondary schools. Much of the progress and success at the elementary level can be attributed to those parents desirous of having their children develop a positive attitude toward education at an early age. Much of the early educational successes of children are established as a direct result of an interest expressed by concerned parents.

In addition, many parents are sending children to school for the first time and they want to know something about the educational system, program, and perhaps the teacher. As a student progresses through the grades, or as additional siblings enter school, many parents lose contact through the junior high years and experience almost a total lack of contact during the high school years.

Frequently, as a student advances through the grades, about the only contact his parents have with the school is through the reporting system, for discipline, or for an announcement concerning some honor or award.

Concerning this lack of home-school contact Lombard (40) stated that,

> ...some of the reasons stated are that the children do not want their parents to know the teachers; that teachers are indifferent to the opinions and problems of the parents; that parents have unconsciously a sense of inferiority or timidity in approaching high school principals and teachers.

Most parents with children in school today were educated under the Carnegie System or some modification of an equally traditional system. Consequently, many of today's parents have some difficulty relating to the current educational program of their children. Many parents have little or very limited understanding of flexible modular schedules, IGE, LGE, BSCS biology and what many consider to be equally confusing educational jargon.

The reasons for the lack of data concerning home visits are that very few teachers conduct individual home visits and very few schools initiate, encourage, or require home visits to take place. The literature suggests that some form of explanation of the entire high school educational program should be conducted for the edification of parents with students currently enrolled in high school.

The concept of some type of rapport between home and school has been suggested for about as long as there have been parents with children to send to school. The suggestion of home-school contact has not always been harmonious through the ages of civilization; however, the interrelational role between home and school was suggested by the ancients.

Svadkovskij (65), in his writing concerning the family and school in ancient times, described the Romans as believing that only the mother and father could give a child a good education. Only the school could provide the needed education for the Greeks. In order to have a good citizenry

and to have brave soldiers, it was only the school which could provide the music and poetry which marked the educated individual.

Negative aspects of home and school interrelations have been attributed to the ancient Greek philosopher Plato. Indications are that Plato believed that in an ideal society the children should be placed into a public educational establishment at the earliest possible date. According to Plato's philosophy of the ideal educational system the family would be denied the right to raise the children.

In the Middle Ages the monasteries were the repository for children to be educated. The growth of many parochial systems, directed by monks, was thus established during this time. The monks directed their particular parochial education to their charges and often became greater influencing factors than their families. This method of education eroded and frequently discouraged any family-school relationships. For generations many of the monasteries, and later the convents, were assured of continued membership into the novice ranks through the influence of early indoctrination of the students sent to them for an education.

The role of the family during the Renaissance in relation to the educational development of children varied widely in different cultures. In Europe, national cultures involved their families in home-school relationships in various ways. Some cultures had a close family-school association while others experienced a lesser degree of home-school relationships, but the family was reestablished as the primary center for the raising of children.

Over 400 years ago, Malcaster in Lombard (40) wrote:

> Parents and teachers should not only be acquainted but on friendly terms with each other. Parents and teachers should be familiarly linked together in amity and continual conference for their common charge and each should trust in the judgment and personal good will of the other.

Near the close of the 18th century and into the 19th century, theories were frequently tendered as to the role of the family in the educational process of students. Pestalozzi in Svadkovskij (65) argued for a rational education of children through the spirit of family relations between home and school. Commencing with the 19th century the German philosopher Fichte in Svadkovskij (65) originated an educational program of public rearing of school children in lieu of family responsibility.

The problem to be considered with the many aspects of home-school relationships traditionally has been to determine the role of the family as compared with the role of the institution acting in place of the family.

In the society of today the home is the center for the responsibility of raising the family. This is not to say that only the school has an educational role and that education does not take place in the home. Education occurs in many places, and through various means, but the schools are involved somewhat in the program of "in loco parentis."

While both school and home may deny that "in loco parentis" exists in elementary and secondary schools, one merely needs to familiarize himself with the various services which are extended by the schools and expected by many parents and students.

In a 1929 study of home visits, Crow (12) concluded:

> ...that a study of this kind is well worthwhile because of the attention which is focused upon the various school problems.

In a survey conducted in 1930 by the National Education Association Department of Elementary School Principals, and published in their Research Bulletin (69), 178 principals were asked to rate various educational topics. Three items of concern for this investigation are of interest.

	Very useful	Sometimes valuable	Practically worthless	No answer
Parent interviews	152	22	1	3
Principal visits home	75	60	13	30
Teacher visits home	86	54	11	27

In a 1931 report edited by Edwards (16) numerous methods of establishing contact with the home were reviewed, but it is doubtful whether any of those in common use fully serves the purpose. Edwards writes that such events as parent evenings at the school, while successful, often leave many questions unanswered. As a result, many parents may have misunderstandings, dissatisfaction about the school and the progress of the student. He concluded that other avenues must be investigated if the parent is to be fully informed about the school and its programs.

Huggett (27) implies that one of the principal goals of home visits is to familiarize parents with the work of the public school. At any particular time, some teachers will have an open disdain for the visitation program and feel that they are not welcome in the home. After a few visits have been made, most teachers were convinced of the usefulness of the plan. Huggett concludes that because of the home visitation program many problems have been averted because the parents were informed of the progress and the general work of the school.

In more recent times, Crawford and Haines (11) reported in their study that home visiting was expensive in time and effort. In their study

two teachers conducted home visits to representative student homes whose parents had been carefully selected.

The Ann Arbor public schools were conducting home visits in 1938 as reported by Karsian (32). Karsian states that visits to the home of every junior high school pupil by the adviser constitute one of the steps in the guidance program at Ann Arbor. The findings of his study indicate that the process of home visitation is time consuming but the expenditure of time and effort was considered to be worthwhile considering the benefits which were derived.

Throughout the late 1930's and through the 1940's most of the literature followed the vein of a survey which often asked the teacher to note the environmental conditions of the home in which the child resided. Such conditions to be noted mentally were economic status, social status, language spoken in the home, and the general educational environment provided. Most of the literature involved visitations conducted by elementary teachers and generally concluded that much can be learned by a visit to the home which cannot be learned by an interview at school.

Allen (1) in his writing believes that the home visitation program bears directly upon every phase of school life. He also states that when a school extends a special invitation to the parents to visit the school, it is usually the parents of academically successful children who always attend. Seldom does the teacher see the parents she would like to meet or should meet.

In the area of public relations, Schreiber (60) considers the home visit as one of the most satisfactory and productive methods of publicizing the work of the schools and creating and maintaining support for its

program. In his view once the confidence of the parents is gained through a home visit there need be no apprehension with regard to their attitude toward school. Schreiber contends that there are too few ways to determine just how correctly parents and taxpayers interpret information provided by the media. To achieve the most positive result a teacher calling on a home must possess an understanding of the objectives and philosophy of the school and be in agreement with the principles of the school. If a teacher does not maintain the convictions of the institution, his integrity and the sincerity of the message he carries will be in question.

No pattern of home visitations was ascertained from the review of literature. Many programs have been suggested and tried in a number of school systems. The literature revealed that there is basically no prescribed procedure to the visitation program. In certain circumstances, the literature revealed that the visitation program was on an individual basis and, in others, by grade level and occasionally by building or district.

Burke (7) describes her home visit as a time to sit down together over tea and through an informal atmosphere to let the parents tell their story and at the same time learn some revealing facts about her teaching.

In his school system Brown (6) noted that the procedure for home visits was easy at the elementary level, but difficulty was encountered in the secondary school where classes were departmentalized. In this situation the home room teacher contacted the parents if he taught the child. The stated purpose of the home visits by Brown were: to gain a better understanding of the child so that his time spent in school would be more profitable; to increase the cooperation and understanding of the

home and school; and to develop a friendly relationship between the teacher, pupil and parents. An evaluation of the visitation program was conducted by means of a brief questionnaire. The results were favorable and indicated the goal had been established. The underlying factor for continuation of the program was for the benefit of the child. The parents and teachers believe that the child does better work when the home as well as the school is interested. The unanimous opinion of the parents and teachers indicated that the program merited continuation for another year.

On a systemwide basis Haehlen (21) writes that for several years Waverly, Iowa, conducted a program of home visitation, at all levels, usually during American Education Week. In his view interest in home visitation is greatest at the elementary level but is also well received at the junior high and senior high levels. The pattern for visitation was varied slightly because of the records the older students had accumulated and the teacher would have a fairly complete composite of the student in the junior high or senior high folder. As a result, different problems would be discussed with a parent of a junior high or senior high student.

In a Springfield, Missouri, study of the merit of home visitation, Wilkerson (71) and his staff visited the homes of approximately 800 students. At the completion of the visitation program a questionnaire was distributed to the teachers and parents. The teachers were greatly in favor of the continuation of the program. The questionnaire was sent to 800 homes with 312 completed surveys returned. Of those responding, the

percentages for the continuation of the program were highly positive. Wilkerson also reported that as a result of the survey, the school has enjoyed the benefits of increased attendance at meetings, school functions, a high percentage for an affirmative bond vote, and a greater rapport of an intangible nature between teachers, parents and students.

The majority of the literature presented the home visit in a favorable light. In a limited number of cases, a warning was offered in the consideration of home visits. In graduate research conducted by Kornegay (35), he writes that it is not necessary to visit all the student homes and a one hundred percent home visitation record is not always an accomplishment of which to be proud. Conclusions drawn are that teachers must be careful not to be sitting in judgment, and must know the emotional conditions of the home. Finally, Kornegay warns that while there are benefits that may be obtained from home visitations, some students will feel that because they come from a poor or unhappy home environment the teacher has discovered a secret which may be a source of future embarrassment.

A negative view of home visits is shared by Machnits (43) who states that the teacher is invading the privacy of the home. An added condition suggested by the author is that the parent has an awareness that his home is being evaluated. The author suggests that the only time a teacher should visit a home is at the request of the parent or perhaps at the invitation of the student.

In the view of McKee (48), the teacher should visit the home if some concrete accomplishment will occur. However, he also states that no teacher should be required to visit homes when the teacher sees no value in the visit.

In more recent years the opinion expressed by a number of teachers and administrators is that it may be impossible or even undesirable to visit all homes. Helberg (24) writes that administrators cannot influence parents to visit the school as readily as they can influence teachers to visit the home. In many cases after a teacher has visited a home the parent is encouraged to visit the school. Helberg suggests, as others have, that parents appreciate the visits if issues are resolved and that in most cases the student is benefited. He suggests that an order be established in the visitation sequence. A proposal would be to first visit special cases, new students and then the remainder of the student body.

The literature revealed that while many schools have participated in home visitation of one variety or another, or at one time or another, there is one academic which has used home visitation as a part of its program for many years. Agricultural education has used the home visit as an established feature in its academic program in many areas.

Atherton (3) probably speaks for many when he describes the purpose of the home visitation program in the agricultural education area. He believes that one of the purposes of a home visit is to develop a mutual understanding and to gain the confidence of those contacted. Atherton concludes with a summary which could be basically applied to other teachers interested in, or about to conduct, a home visit. These include:

1. Deciding whom to visit at this time.
2. Clarifying the reasons for the visit.
3. Scheduling the visit.
4. Reviewing the background of those to be visited.

5. Making the visit, being a good observer and a good listener. Following through on the implementation of the reason for the visit.

6. Summarization of the visit and the recording of pertinent information.

7. Using the things learned from the visit.

There is a recurring theme in the area of teacher visits to homes of students taking agricultural education. The message usually is that if a teacher visits a home he will be better able to interpret the student's academic needs through an assessment of the home environment. Through the visit the teacher develops a rapport for the betterment of the overall school relations as a means of understanding.

In the area of agricultural education the proponents of home visits stress that through the social atmosphere created by the visit, the agricultural education teacher may discover other educational needs of the student. The teacher will then be able to incorporate his observations into directed action and offer his suggestions to other teachers so they may benefit the other educational needs of the student.

The importance of first-hand farm visit observations is emphasized by Atherton in his writings of 1955 (2) and he continued to expound on the virtues of the home visit in his writings of 1966 (3). Atherton's views are supported in substance by Eastman(15), Smith (63) and Bail (4), who indicated support for the premises of others in this field and offered suggestions of their own. These writers stress the need for home visitations, citing the goals of providing information, gathering information for needed planning for educational needs of the students, an observation

of the home atmosphere, and creation of a social rapport for the support of the school and its activities.

Bail (4) suggests that teachers of vocational agriculture incorporate a visit to prospective agriculture students during the summer. The suggestions he made have the flavor of recruitment but the primary message is one of providing program information, student guidance, and public support of the vocational agricultural programs.

As indicated at the beginning of the review, most of the literature has been brief and generally without statistical support. The answer to the problem about a lack of data and writing concerning home visits is that very few teachers conduct home visits individually and very few schools initiate, encourage, or require home visits to take place. The literature which has appeared is primarily doctoral research or occasionally related research which has appeared in the journals.

The research which has been reported concerning teacher home visits and other educational issues, of a substantive and supportive nature, has frequently utilized the semantic differential as a technique which has been used with success in the measurement of attitudes.

Research by Husek and Wittrock (28) concerning the dimensions of attitudes toward teachers stressed that the semantic differential, as developed by Osgood et al., 1957, was a technique and not a test (54). In their study of 259 students in an educational psychology course, the concept "school teachers" was rated on each of 117 scales. As an example, the researchers found that a mean of 2.19 was attained on a 7 point scale, where 1 indicated the most positive evaluation and 7 the most negative evaluation for 13 scales termed general evaluation on the scale of

attitude of students toward public school teachers. The authors concluded that the positive results may have occurred because the participants were preparing for the teaching profession. The final conclusion suggests:

> It is highly improbable that in the relatively homogeneous domain of attitude toward public school teachers the general Evaluative factor will break down into activity, potency, and evaluation dimensions. The results of the study should not be construed as identifying the relative importance of dimensions of attitudes toward teachers. Factor analysis helps to structure the domain; it does not determine the importance of parts.

In research conducted by Heath and Braund (23), using the semantic differential as a technique for staff interpersonal evaluation of a selected school system, the researchers conclude that:

> ...the type of measurement is useful in a variety of ways, particularly to public school administrators.

If a reliable measuring instrument is used with an established validity, there may be a new source of information for administrators concerning staff relationships.

The literature revealed that, as years pass, educational terms often remain the same but the meanings attached to those terms often reflect a different connotation. This is the case with home visits also. During the 1930's the home visit inferred that a teacher called on the homes of her students. During the 1940's the term home visit was often equated with discipline and frequently was interpreted as a visit from the truant officer. During the 1950's the term was construed to mean the same as a teacher conference, and the two terms were often used so interchangeably that it became difficult to ascertain if the visit took place at the school or in the home. The literature of the 1960's often refers to a select group of individuals to be included in the teacher home visit program.

Finally, during the 1970's the literature frequently refers to the term visiting teacher which often refers to a version of a truant officer or a principal designated to visit a home because of a particular problem.

Horn (26) writes about a typical example as a visiting teacher associated with the VIP program in Omaha, Nebraska Title I public schools. Part of the teaching requirement for the Title I program in Omaha is to participate in home visitation.

Home visits are also conducted regularly for students involved in the Head Start Program and the Outreach Program in the Minneapolis, Minnesota schools. The visitation program serves to allow the teacher to observe the home environment and to allow the parents and student the opportunity to meet the teacher.

Horn (26) in his writing quotes the NEA Research Bulletin of 1955 which states:

> ...that less than 10 percent of the schools have an organized program to encourage home visits.

Horn concludes that there is little reason to believe that the percentages have increased and that few teachers have ever conducted home visits and those that have are generally elementary teachers.

In many areas during the late 1960's and into the early 1970's the country has experienced an unprecedented change due to urban growth, redistricting, bussing, and consolidation. As a result, in some areas, the size, distances involved, and changes within various districts have resulted in the curtailment of teacher home visits. For these reasons many districts have placed visitation purely on a voluntary basis and direct communication between the school and home often occurs through school conferences or a back-to-school night.

The semantic differential as a technique for image analysis of public school teachers was reported by Wittrock et al. (72) as a technique to quantify word meaning. From their study the researchers concluded that:

> The factor structure obtained in a semantic differential study depends upon several variables: the variety of concepts, the variety and number of scales, the heterogeneity of the population of subjects, and the type of analysis performed on the data.

The respondents were asked to complete the entire questionnaire and to refrain from leaving any blank spaces. Invariably, in any project which asks laymen to respond to an unfamiliar instrument, individuals will leave a blank space occasionally. The question arises concerning the effect of the blanks on the outcome of the instrument.

Oetting (53) in his research reports:

> ...a forced choice technique is apparently valid for the semantic differential in that forced responses tend to have the same pattern as neutral responses.

The literature provided research completed by authors who investigated the use of the semantic differential as a technique to evaluate concepts such as self-ratings, student attitude toward teachers, and the attitude of secondary and college students.

An analysis by Gulo (20) of rural students' opinions toward their teachers revealed unfavorableness increased as the students passed through the grades. The older student tended to evaluate his teachers in less favorable terms as compared with the younger student.

Additional studies have been conducted by Long et al. (41) which used the semantic differential as a technique which involved elementary school children in self-ratings. The findings indicate that as a child matures

the frequency of extreme answers tends to decrease as compared with the use of neutral and more qualified answers.

The use of the semantic differential was discussed by Cassel (9) in his study to assess the attitude of secondary and college students through the development of a semantic differential. Cassel investigated three main concepts which he used to standardize his technique for secondary students. They are:

1. What I learned in class.
2. The teacher of this class.
3. Me as a student.

Of the three concepts (learning, teacher, student), Cassel found a significant change in the concept student in his pre- and post-college students.

Research conducted in England by Sharrock (61) reaffirms many of the recommendations of American researchers. While the educational systems of the two countries are quite different, educators and parents share a common goal for the education of youth. The suggestion for needed research in England calls for an investigation of the home and school relationship because of the supposed connection between the school performance of the student in relationship to the home environment. Sharrock calls for research which would incorporate a questionnaire to ascertain the attitudes of secondary school-home relations, parent-teacher opinions, and student attitudes concerning teachers, parents, school, and the home. Since all of the factors are interrelated, Sharrock notes a distinct absence of supportive research in the areas described.

Langdon and Stout (37) write that whether the interview takes place in the home or at school is of little concern. The main concern in their view is that the interview takes place. They view the setting as immaterial and hold the opinion that often the occasion of the first visit, whether at home or at school, will frequently set the stage for additional visits at one or the other locations.

Doctoral research in the area of home visitation and related opinions to the area have been rather limited. One of the earlier dissertations by Davidson (13) was concerned with the implementation of a scientific method for the collection and analysis of information gathered concerning opinions and attitudes of public education. A number of demographic variables that local citizens associated with the public schools in their geographic area were evaluated. Conclusions were made that the sampling procedures and analysis were accurate for future educational policy decisions. Additional conclusions were made that the citizenry were satisfied, willing, and able to provide continued support for their schools.

Doctoral research by Schoenhard (59) was concerned with the utilization of home visits as a means of raising the academic standing of underachieving students in high school. The program involved the use of a visiting teacher to selected student homes dubbed underachievers by the guidance department and did not include a visit to all student homes.

Other research which involves visits to the home by a visiting teacher has been reported by Khouri (34), Swinsick (66) and Ross (57). These studies are similar to the study of Schoenhard (59) in that they are concerned with the academic performance of a student as a result of a visit

to the home by an "attendance officer" who serves in "specialized service." The aforementioned studies have been concentrated on the home and school visitor program in Pennsylvania and generally involve guidance personnel, school administrators, and school visiting teachers. No indication was made that all teachers were involved in a systemized visitation program.

In research of the community and teacher perception of what a good school looks like and what schools could do was reported by Macagnoni (42). The study included 200 community members and 188 teachers which categorized favorable and unfavorable responses toward the school. While attitudes and opinions of various socioeconomic groups were sought, no indication was evident that the faculty went directly to the homes for the compilation of data.

Manlove (44) surveyed and completed an appraisal of opinions gathered from parents, students, and faculty members of the Richmond Senior High School. The study was comparable to the study of Macagnoni (42) and reported substantially the same findings.

In a study conducted by Rowland (58) in Ypsilanti, Michigan, the investigator collected opinions concerning the differences of opinion between parents and staff concerning the goals of secondary education. While a number of variables were taken into account, the home visit was not considered. The researcher was involved primarily in the gathering of data which could ultimately be used by school administrators in the formation of a public relations program.

Research by Farmer (18) in the area of teacher home visits and attitude and achievement towards school of Mexican-American students indicated a positive change in attitude and an improvement of grades.

The author notes, however, that in further studies the number of students in the sample should be increased and that teacher participation should be voluntary.

McCutcheon (47) writes that in his study of the effect of a planned program of home visitation by teachers on student attitude, attendance, and achievement, no significant differences were found. A suggestion was offered that the program be continued and that the visitation program aided in rapport between school and home.

There were no significant differences found by Johnson (29) in his investigation of the relationships between high school seniors' satisfaction with school and selected school, personal, and home factors.

The review revealed that the semantic differential has been utilized by researchers in areas primarily concerned with various samplings of teacher and student inquiries. No studies using the semantic differential as a technique for the investigation of teacher home visits were discovered. Studies in related areas were found occasionally.

Demak (14) used the semantic differential in his investigation of the meanings of educational concepts of educationally disadvantaged children. Participants in the study included primarily minority and lower socio-economic status children and their teachers. No significant differences were found in the means to responses of educational concepts and self-concepts for lower class, middle class students, or teachers. A significant difference was found within middle class white children for the concepts "I am" and "I would like to be."

An Iowa study by Heath (22) incorporated the semantic differential to analyze teacher characteristics as perceived by students. Findings

indicated that among other results there was no significant agreement between ability groups when considering the same teacher characteristics. The three ability groups had a significant degree of agreement in their perception of teacher characteristics when grade level was considered.

Quisenberry (56) writes that the semantic differntial proved to be an adequate instrument for measuring perceptions of students toward women high school physical education teachers and that, in the student opinion, perceptual differences exist between women high school physical education teachers and other women high school teachers.

Travis (67) in recent research reported the findings of Americans, non-Americans, professional educators and students toward selected teacher characteristics which utilized the semantic differential. The basic conclusions drawn by the author, based on the findings, were that different groups tend to view teacher characteristics differently.

The review of literature revealed that research concerning teacher home visits and polls of educational opinion were frequently related to studies which were conducted by individual teachers, counselors concerned with special cases and schools seeking to improve their image through a public relations program.

The literature revealed that little research has been conducted by a school concerning the interrelationships of the home and school. As a result there are few studies from which comparisons may be drawn. The literature also revealed that comparatively little has been done to ascertain the effectiveness of a variety of types of home and school contact and a special void was apparent in the area of direct home contact by teachers in the secondary area.

Recommendations for further study frequently suggested a study that surveyed the opinions of each group toward the expectations of the other or a study of parental attitudes as a method of improving home-school relations with the thought of increasing the level of student attainment.

Other recommendations suggested a parental attitude questionnaire which would assess the attitudes of parents to various aspects of the relations between home and school and their attitudes in general toward educational topics.

Studies were reviewed which reported the opinions of students, parents or teachers individually, or in some combination, but generally not collectively.

Research and recommendations reviewed indicated a need for additional studies to ascertain needed relevant relations between home and school. A compilation of suggestions indicated a need for a study to survey the attitudes of various groups collectively in order to assess the many factors which may affect the attitudes, behavior, and attainment of students, the teachers' attitudes toward parental contact, and parental attitudes toward school and home relations.

In considering research into the relations between home and school contact, the literature indicates that the two are linked to the performance of the student. Since the two are related, a logical study seemed to be to investigate the methods in which the three roles vary and yet are similar.

From the development of a research questionnaire some assessment of the opinions of parents, teachers, and students which considers the various aspects of home-school relations and their opinions toward

selected educational topics will be determined. As a result of an investigation the information provided may improve the relationship and understanding for all groups concerned.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

As a result of the review of literature the investigator sought a school system which was considered to be innovative and receptive to an investigation of the type suggested by the literature and discussed through personal communication. Ultimately, Mason City High School of Mason City, Iowa, was selected as a participant in the study. The school system is considered to be innovative in its curriculum, faculty, and administration. The community has readily supported bond issues and the physical facilities are either relatively new or recently remodeled.

Mason City is a north Iowa community with a population of approximately 30,000. The community derives its support from several large manufacturing, industrial, and processing concerns such as cement manufacturing, meat processing, and dairy and grain processing. Other large employers are the school district, medical facilities, and a number of smaller industries and local businesses.

The investigation was developed and conducted as part of an administrative project called Project Outreach MCHS (More Contact Home and School). The program was designed to provide more home-school contact and was to provide a more effective means of explaining the school's educational programs through personal communication. The goal of the investigation was to have all staff members visit the homes of the entire student population. Through home visitation each staff member sought to explain, to parents, the school's educational programs and provided, for future reference, an informational folder which detailed the educational programs, policies, and procedures. Each faculty member visited a

home for a sufficient time to complete the established project goals and to answer any additional questions concerning the school system.

The investigator sought the opinions of individuals concerning teacher home visits and other educational topics as they related to Mason City High School. Information for this study was obtained from teachers, administrators, parents and students.

The study involved 110 faculty members and 180 students of Mason City High School. Also included was a random sample of 379 parents of students. Parents in the sample were categorized into three groups: parents of high school students, parents of recent graduates, and parents of ninth grade students who would be sophomores the following year.

The entire high school faculty was included in the study. Participating parents and students were selected from their respective populations. Names of parents with students currently enrolled and names of parents with students graduated the previous year were selected from lists compiled and supplied by the administration of Mason City High School. In some instances, the addresses were updated by consulting the City Directory (45) of Mason City and the Mason City Telephone Directory.

Information for the investigation was obtained by means of a questionnaire which was comprised of three sections and was developed from three sources. The first section contained 22 questions taken from the Education Scale as developed by Rundquist and Sletto in Shaw and Wright (62) for which the scale strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree was used as the format for response to a particular item. The second section contained 16 questions which were

taken from the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire as compiled by Bentley and Rempel (5) and which used the scale agree, probably agree, probably disagree, and disagree as the format for response. The third section consisted of six concepts from the Semantic Differential as developed by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (54). Each concept was rated by 12 pairs of bipolar adjectives, six from the evaluative scale and six from the potency scale as outlined by Osgood et al. (54).

The instrument was identical in form for all groups except for certain demographic data which identified the respondent as a member of the faculty, a parent, or student. Copies of the questionnaires and introductory letters are included in the Appendix. The questionnaires were coded numerically to indicate a particular group while insuring individual anonymity.

The investigation was initiated in August, 1972, beginning with the workshop for teachers prior to the opening of the 1972-73 school year. The faculty was randomly divided into two groups for the purpose of this investigation. Half of the faculty completed the instrument before the teacher home visits occurred, and the other half completed the instrument after the home visits were completed and prior to the opening of school.

Each faculty member in both groups had approximately 15 homes to call on as his part of the home visitation assignment. The assignment of 15 families per faculty member insured that the entire student population was included in the study. The families were selected from the alphabetized student enrollment roster. Each staff member received approximately five sophomore, five junior, and five senior students as his part of the assignment. Alphabetic assignment helped to insure that no teacher received any

particular sex, ethnic, or socioeconomic type when based on scale of habitat.

The investigator mailed a questionnaire to a parent, randomly selected from each group of parents assigned to individual faculty members during the course of the investigation. The names were obtained from the official register of students and parents provided by the administration. The first group of parents selected for this investigation received a questionnaire during the week of the teacher workshop but prior to the commencement of the teacher home visits. With each parent questionnaire a letter of explanation was included which asked the participant to return the completed instrument within one week. Each letter contained a self-addressed postage paid envelope for the use of the respondent. A copy of the parent instrument and the introductory letter is included in the Appendix.

After the teacher home visits had been conducted, the remaining portion of the faculty participated in the investigation by completing the faculty questionnaire. During the workshop week the remaining portion of families was contacted by the faculty members. The method of contact and the number of families contacted were identical in procedure to that described for the first group.

Data from the students were collected within five areas of the high school. The areas selected represented a cross-section of the student congregation and a representative sample of sex and class. The collection points of student data were the library, mathematics resource center, language resource center, social studies resource center, and the

cafeteria-commons area. All student data were collected in the high school after the home visits had been completed.

Data received from respondents were verified and analyzed from coded information by the Iowa State University Computation Center. A correlation matrix was run on responses on each statement to determine the relationships that existed between responses to each statement.

The data were analyzed by weighting the responses for each section in the following manner:

Section 1

Responses	Numerical values	Meaning
SA	1	Strongly Agree
A	2	Agree
U	3	Undecided
D	4	Disagree
SD	5	Strongly Disagree

Section 2

Responses	Numerical values	Meaning
A	1	Agree
PA	2	Probably Agree
PD	3	Probably Disagree
D	4	Disagree

Section 3

Each item (pairing of a specific concept with a specific scale) presents the following situation:

polar term X ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ polar term Y
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

in which the scale positions have already been defined for the subject in the instructions as:

(1) extremely X
(2) quite X
(3) slightly X
(4) neither X nor Y; equally X and Y
(5) slightly Y
(6) quite Y
(7) extremely Y

The scales used were determined to be reliable after being tested by using the reliability technique based on the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (51, 52). All subsequent procedures used in the analysis of the data were based on the same program.

The statistical treatment used for this investigation was the analysis of variance as described by Wert et al. (70). When mean differences were found the Scheffe test was used for post hoc comparisons which determined the strength and direction of the mean differences. In all cases the .01 (**) and .05 (*) probability levels of the F test were used to test differences in the means. Summary tables indicating the statistical results are included in the Findings chapter and individual tables for each variable concept are included in the Appendix.

FINDINGS

The findings of this investigation are based on data analysis obtained from the responses of faculty members, parent groups, and students. All statistical data are presented in summary tables throughout this chapter while tables for each concept, variable, and category may be found in the Appendix.

Data presented in Table 1 exhibit the number of responses to the investigation by the various groups. Table 1 also presents the total usable responses incorporated for data analysis, percent of return, and the percent of usable responses for each category.

The questionnaire was returned by 488 respondents from an initial sample of 669, with 450 questionnaires being utilized for statistical consideration. Questionnaires which were considered to be incomplete or contained insufficient data were not included in the investigation. Occasionally, incomplete questionnaires contained statements which indicated the reason the respondent failed to complete the instrument. Some of the reasons for not participating included lack of knowledge concerning the system and/or the project, movement from the city, failure to comprehend the issues within the questionnaire, and personal reasons.

Coefficient alpha was obtained as a measure of reliability for each of the three sections of the instrument and the reliability routine (64) of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (51, 52) was used to obtain the reliability estimates.

Table 1. Respondents within classifications

Group	Questionnaires sent	Total responses	Percentage of total responses	Usable responses	Percentage of usable responses
Previsit teachers	57	48	84.21	47	82.45
Post visit teachers	53	38	71.69	37	69.81
Total teachers	110	86	78.18	84	76.36
Previsit parents	132	53	40.15	50	37.87
Post visit parents	132	85	64.39	83	62.87
Post high school parents	42	32	76.19	27	64.28
Junior high parents	73	52	71.23	43	58.90
Total parents	379	222	58.57	201	53.03
Total students	180	180	100	165	91.67

Section one of the instrument contained 22 variables which measured the respondents' attitude toward the value of education or of being educated, and consisted of the Education Scale as developed by Rundquist and Sletto in Shaw and Wright (62). A standardized alpha of .84 was realized which compares favorably with the standardized alpha of .83 obtained by Rundquist and Sletto.

The inclusion of the Education Scale concept as one section of the instrument is justified by Shaw and Wright (62, pp. 232-3). Scales which measure attitudes through abstract concepts are described by the authors as:

> In addition to attitudes which are held toward persons, groups of persons, and other essentially social objects, individuals develop attitudes toward the events and situations produced by these objects and in which the objects occur or are involved. Thus many attitudes possess intangibles as their referents.

Shaw and Wright elaborate further on the use of abstract concepts, of which the Education Scale is a part:

> Referents of the attitudes measured by scales may be differentiated from others on the following basis:
>
> 1. All referents are abstract.
> 2. The abstracts which serve as referents to the scales are all relatively specific in nature.
> 3. The concepts themselves are connotatively neutral and are very frequently dealt with in a nonevaluative manner.
>
> Thus the concept of problem solving has no a priori evaluative connotation, but may be given one by the conceptualizer. Further, one often deals with problem solving in a nonevaluative manner.
>
> The nonevaluative quality of the referents is to be compared with referents of social practices (which possess the quality of preferability) and of social

> issues (which are evaluative to the extent that they possess at least two connotations: the pros and the cons).

Section two contained three categories from the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire as developed by Bentley and Rempel (5, p. 4). Each category contained five variables and the three categories included were: curriculum issues, community support of education, and community pressures. A standardized alpha of .83 was realized for the 15 variables investigated.

Bentley and Rempel (5, p. 1) describe the purpose and use of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire as:

> ...designed to provide a measure of teacher morale. Not only does the Opinionaire yield a total score indicating the general level of a teacher's morale, but it also provides meaningful sub-scores which break down morale into some of its dimensions. The Opinionaire provides specific and valid information about crucial problems and tensions which concern the faculty.

A description of each category used includes:

"Curriculum Issues" - solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship.

"Community Support of Education" - deals with the extent to which the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational system.

"Community Pressures" - gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.

Section three contained six concepts and each concept utilized two scales of the semantic differential technique and established reliabilities of:

Concept	Evaluative Scale	Potency Scale
1	.81	.55
2	.80	.59
3	.79	.59
4	.84	.58
5	.87	.62
6	.88	.57

The logic of semantic differentiation is best described by Osgood (54, p. 20) who states that the sensitivity of the instrument is increased by inserting a scale between each pair of terms, so that the subject may indicate both direction and intensity of each judgment.

> The semantic differential is essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures. We provide the subject with a concept to be differentiated and a set of bipolar adjectival scales against which to do it, his only task being to indicate, for each item (pairing of a concept with a scale), the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale.

Demographic data were obtained and analyzed for descriptive interpretation from the previsit and post visit teachers for the variables of sex, age, degree, total experience, and Mason City High School (MCHS) experience. Data presented in Table 23 through Table 102 in the Appendix indicate the mean, standard deviation, and number of participants for each cell and variable of the instrument.

Eighty-six faculty members, or 78.18 percent of the 110 faculty members, responded to the questionnaire. Two respondents provided insufficient information and their responses were not utilized in the data analysis. Forty-seven teachers were included in the previsit group and 37 teachers comprised the post visit group for a total of 84 usable responses. A composite of the demographic teacher data used in this investigation is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary presentation of the descriptive data categories for all teachers (N=84)

Teacher category	Age range		Mean age
	Minimum	Maximum	Years
Teacher age	21	62	36.08
Teacher experience	0	37	11.71
Mason City District experience	0	35	6.96
Mason City High School experience	0	33	6.26

Age was considered a variable and all teachers were placed into three categories: under 30 years, 30 to 39 years and 40 years and older. When all faculty respondents were considered by age the range was 21 to 62 years with a mean age of 36.08.

When teaching experience was examined, data in Table 2 indicate that a range of 0.0 to 37 years with a mean of 11.71 years was discovered. When teaching experience was further examined, data in Table 2 indicate that the range for teaching within the Mason City system was 0.0 years to 35 years with a mean of 6.96 years. Teaching experience within the high school produced a mean of 6.26 years for the range of 0.0 to 33 years experience.

Data analysis for Mason City High School (MCHS) experience and total teaching experience was examined individually with teachers being placed into three experience categories for each group. Mason City High School (MCHS) experience categories included: 4 years or less, 5 to 9 years and 10 years and over. Total teaching experience categories included: 6 years or less, 7 to 14 years and 15 years and above.

A summary of descriptive data for the individual respective teacher groups is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary presentation of the descriptive data for individual teacher groups

Teacher category	Age range		Mean age
	Minimum	Maximum	Years
Previsit male teachers (N=33)			
Teacher age	21	56	34.97
Teacher experience	0	34	12.00
Mason City District experience	0	24	5.51
Mason City High School experience	0	14	4.63
Post visit male teachers (N=27)			
Teacher age	22	59	37.88
Teacher experience	0	37	13.14
Mason City District experience	0	35	8.66
Mason City High School experience	0	33	8.03
All male teachers (N=60)			
Teacher age	21	59	36.28
Teacher experience	0	37	12.51
Mason City District experience	0	35	6.93
Mason City High School experience	0	33	6.16
Previsit female teachers (N=14)			
Teacher age	22	57	31.92
Teacher experience	0	34	8.07
Mason City District experience	0	27	5.64
Mason City High School experience	0	27	5.21
Post visit female teachers (N=10)			
Teacher age	23	62	40.62
Teacher experience	1	30	12.00
Mason City District experience	0	20	9.00
Mason City High School experience	0	20	8.30
All female teachers (N=24)			
Teacher age	22	62	35.58
Teacher experience	0	34	9.70
Mason City District experience	0	27	7.04
Mason City High School experience	0	27	6.05
All previsit teachers (N=47)			
Teacher age	21	57	34.06
Teacher experience	0	34	10.83
Mason City District experience	0	27	5.55
Mason City High School experience	0	27	4.80
All post visit teachers (N=37)			
Teacher age	22	62	38.64
Teacher experience	0	37	12.83
Mason City District experience	0	35	8.75
Mason City High School experience	0	33	8.10

Parents with students in high school were placed into two groups. One group was surveyed before the teacher home visits occurred while the other group was surveyed after the visits were completed. Tables 4 and 5 present data obtained from the two parent groups.

Table 4. Completion of the previsit parent questionnaire by parent category

Respondent	Number	Percent
Mother	28	52.8
Father	21	39.6
Guardian	2	3.8
Both	2	3.8
Total	53	100.0

Table 5. Completion of the questionnaire by parent category for post visit parents

		Parent present during home visit			
Respondent		Mother	Father	Both	Total
Mother	Count	32	2	7	41
	Row percent	78.0	4.9	17.1	49.4
	Column percent	78.0	18.2	22.6	
	Cell percent	38.6	2.4	8.4	
Father		5	9	14	28
		17.9	32.1	50.0	33.7
		12.2	81.8	45.2	
		6.0	10.8	16.9	
Guardian		0	0	2	2
		0.0	0.0	100.0	2.4
		0.0	0.0	6.5	
		0.0	0.0	2.4	
Both		4	0	8	12
		33.3	0.0	66.7	14.5
		9.8	0.0	25.8	
		4.8	0.0	9.6	
Total column count		41	11	31	83
Total column percent		49.4	13.3	37.3	100.0

Table 6 presents data collected from parents of students other than those currently enrolled in high school. Parents who had a student in the ninth grade or parents who had a student graduate the year previously but who did not have a student currently enrolled in high school were included in the investigation. Parent groups without students in high school were included to determine if differences of opinion existed between parental groups based on expected, current, or recently completed high school experiences.

Table 6. Completion of the junior high and post high school parent questionnaire by category

Category	Mother	Father	Guardian	Both	Total
Junior high parents					
Number	27	19	0	4	50
Percent	54.0	38.0	0.0	8.0	100.0
Post high parents					
Number	16	11	1	2	30
Percent	53.3	36.7	3.3	6.7	100.0
Combined junior high and post high parents					
Number	43	30	1	6	80
Percent	53.8	37.5	1.3	7.5	100.0

Student data were collected equally from both sexes and from sophomores, juniors, and seniors within five areas of the high school. Table 7 presents the total responses obtained from each sex and class within the five collection areas. Table 8 indicates that 165 student responses, within each class and sex, were considered usable for data analysis.

Table 7. Student data collection by categories of class and sex

Class and sex	Data collection areas					
	Library	Commons-Cafeteria	Mathematics Resource Center	Social Sciences Resource Center	Languages Resource Center	Total
Sophomore						
Male	6	6	6	6	6	30
Female	6	6	6	6	6	30
Junior						
Male	6	6	6	6	6	30
Female	6	6	6	6	6	30
Senior						
Male	6	6	6	6	6	30
Female	6	6	6	6	6	30
Total	36	36	36	36	36	180

Table 8. Total usable student responses by sex and class

Sex	Class			
	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Total
Male	30	30	25	85
Female	28	26	26	80
Total	58	56	51	165

Analysis of variance was employed to test for significant differences in attitude and opinion between the categories of each group and revealed that five significant and six highly significant differences existed. Where applicable the Scheffe test was conducted to compare specific categories when significant mean differences existed for the ANOV.

Individual tables presenting the descriptive data for comparisons between previsit, post visit, and male and female teachers are exhibited in Tables 23 through 38 of the Appendix. Table 9 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between the aforementioned groups. The analysis of variance detected no significant differences between the categories of either group for the concepts.

Table 9. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between previsit and post visit teacher groups and male and female teachers

Concept	Teacher groups	Teacher sex	Teacher groups x teacher sex
Total education scale	0.01	3.33	0.74
Curriculum issues	0.64	0.00001	0.51
Community support of education	0.04	0.08	0.69
Community pressures	0.36	1.10	0.52
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	0.005	0.16	0.96
Mason City High School - potency scale	0.64	0.91	0.16
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.00	0.0003	0.04
Students at MCHS - potency scale	1.22	1.13	0.0007
Education in America - evaluative scale	0.23	1.80	0.25
Education in America - potency scale	0.003	1.83	0.02
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	0.23	1.15	0.17
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	0.52	1.13	0.43
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	1.94	0.17	1.65
Teacher home visits - potency scale	1.40	0.08	1.49
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.34	1.51	0.00003
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	1.72	2.71	0.06

The descriptive data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers and their age categories are individually exhibited in Tables 39 through 54 of the Appendix. Table 10 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data and reveals that a highly significant difference was detected between the age categories for the total Education Scale concept and the community support of education concept.

Table 10. Summary of the analysis of variance F values[a] for comparisons between previsit and post visit teacher groups and teacher age groups of under 30 years old, 30 through 39 years old, and 40 years old and older

Concept	Teacher ages	Teacher groups x teacher ages
Total education scale	8.49**	1.31
Curriculum issues	0.26	1.93
Community support of education	6.30**	0.64
Community pressures	1.15	0.50
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	0.57	0.04
Mason City High School - potency scale	1.12	0.61
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	2.18	0.21
Students at MCHS - potency scale	0.19	0.35
Education in America - evaluative scale	0.82	1.69
Education in America - potency scale	0.42	0.009
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	0.82	1.23
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	1.28	2.51
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	0.80	0.57
Teacher home visits - potency scale	0.75	0.71
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.38	0.52
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.12	0.47

[a]Where applicable in all tables in the text and Appendix:
** = significant at or beyond the 1 percent level
* = significant at or beyond the 5 percent level
n.s. = no significance.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the teacher age categories and revealed that all age categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept.

Teachers under 30 years old disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed by teachers 30 through 39 disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers 40 years old and older disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers 30 through 39 years of age and teachers 40 years old and older,

and between teachers under 30 years of age and teachers 40 years old and older.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the teacher age categories and revealed that all age categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Teachers under 30 years old agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed by teachers 30 through 39 agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers 40 years old and older agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between all teacher age categories.

No significant differences were detected between the teacher visit groups or teacher age categories for the other concepts.

Individual tables presenting the descriptive data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers and their degree categories are exhibited in Tables 55 through 70 of the Appendix. Table 11 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers and their degree categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the teacher degree categories and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Bachelor degree teachers disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score, while teachers possessing a master's degree, or above, agreed more with the concept and obtained the lower mean score.

The analysis of variance detected no significant differences between the categories of either group for the other concepts.

Table 11. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between previsit and post visit teacher groups and teacher degree categories of bachelor's degree, master's degree, or above

Concept	Teacher degrees	Teacher groups x teacher degrees
Total education scale	6.01*	0.00
Curriculum issues	0.99	2.65
Community support of education	1.63	0.03
Community pressures	0.026	0.10
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	1.88	0.06
Mason City High School - potency scale	2.34	0.52
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	1.27	1.63
Students at MCHS - potency scale	0.01	0.56
Education in America - evaluative scale	0.04	0.46
Education in America - potency scale	2.59	0.23
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	2.84	2.53
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	1.24	0.32
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	0.0005	2.17
Teacher home visits - potency scale	0.16	0.18
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	3.51	1.38
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.23	0.11

Individual tables presenting the descriptive data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers and their Mason City High School teaching experience categories are exhibited in Tables 71 through 86 of the Appendix. Table 12 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teacher groups and the MCHS teaching experience categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the Mason City High School teaching experience categories for the total Education Scale and the community support of education concepts, and a significant difference for the community pressures concept.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the MCHS teaching experience categories for the total Education

Table 12. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers and teacher groups of under 4 years, 4 through 9 years, and 10 or more years MCHS teaching experience

Concept	MCHS experience	Teacher groups x MCHS experience
Total education scale	5.87**	1.44
Curriculum issues	0.13	0.15
Community support of education	5.55**	1.24
Community pressures	3.72*	0.45
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	1.04	0.20
Mason City High School - potency scale	0.05	1.23
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.81	0.35
Students at MCHS - potency scale	0.10	0.54
Education in America - evaluative scale	2.38	1.21
Education in America - potency scale	0.83	0.49
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	1.39	0.28
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	0.98	1.30
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	2.03	0.04
Teacher home visits - potency scale	0.39	1.20
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.45	0.01
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.38	1.88

Scale concept and revealed that all categories disagreed with the concept. Teachers with three years or less MCHS experience disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between the least experienced and most experienced MCHS teachers, and a highly significant difference between teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience and those with 10 or more years MCHS experience. No significant difference was detected between teachers with three years

or less MCHS experience and those with four through nine years MCHS experience.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the MCHS teaching experience categories for the community support of education concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers with three years or less MCHS experience agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between the least experienced and the most experienced MCHS teachers, and a highly significant difference between teachers with three years or less MCHS experience and teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience. No significant difference was detected between teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience and teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience.

The analysis of variance for the community pressures concept revealed that all MCHS experience categories disagreed with the concept. Teachers with four through nine years disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers with three years or less MCHS experience disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers with three years or less MCHS experience and teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience. No significant differences were detected between teachers with three years or less MCHS experience and teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience or between teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience and teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience.

No significant differences were detected between the categories of either group for the other concepts.

Individual tables presenting the descriptive data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teacher groups and their total teaching experience categories are exhibited in Tables 87 through 102 of the Appendix. Table 13 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between previsit and post visit teacher groups and their total teaching experience categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the total teaching experience categories for the total Education Scale concept and a significant difference for the community support of education concept.

The highly significant difference between the total teaching experience categories for the total Education Scale concept as detected by the analysis of variance revealed that all categories disagreed with the concept. Teachers with five years or less total experience disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by

Table 13. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers and teacher groups of under 6 years, 6 through 14 years, and 15 or more years total teaching experience

Concept	Total experience	Teacher groups x total experience
Total education scale	7.28**	0.97
Curriculum issues	0.12	2.00
Community support of education	4.00*	0.24
Community pressures	1.64	0.70
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	0.851	0.003
Mason City High School - potency scale	0.56	0.31
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	1.98	0.28
Students at MCHS - potency scale	0.09	0.37
Education in America - evaluative scale	0.91	1.55
Education in America - potency scale	0.453	1.049
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	1.25	0.95
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	0.57	1.91
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	0.88	0.59
Teacher home visits - potency scale	0.50	1.96
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	3.09	0.51
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.94	0.17

teachers with 15 or more years total experience disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers with five years or less total experience and teachers with 15 or more years total experience, and a highly significant difference between teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience and teachers with 15 or more years total experience. No significant difference was detected between teachers with five years or less total experience and teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the total teaching experience categories for the community support of education concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the

concept. Teachers with five years or less total experience agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers with 15 or more years total experience agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers with five years or less total experience and teachers with 15 or more years total experience.

No significant differences were detected between the categories of either group for the other concepts.

Individual tables presenting the descriptive data for comparisons between student class year and student sex are exhibited in Tables 103 through 118 of the Appendix. Table 14 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between student class year and student sex.

The analysis of variance detected one highly significant difference and five significant differences between the categories. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the sexes for the total Education Scale concept and revealed that both sexes disagreed with the concept. Female students disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score while male students disagreed less with the concept and obtained the lower mean score. No significant differences were detected between the sexes for the other concepts.

Table 14. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between sophomore, junior, and senior class years and male and female students

Concept	Student class year	Student sex	Student class year x student sex
Total education scale	1.13	9.36**	1.17
Curriculum issues	0.34	1.75	4.19*
Community support of education	4.31*	0.35	0.66
Community pressures	2.25	2.95	0.99
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	1.43	0.42	2.29
Mason City High School - potency scale	1.13	0.45	0.59
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	1.45	0.19	3.26*
Students at MCHS - potency scale	0.04	0.51	0.21
Education in America - evaluative scale	0.31	0.34	1.61
Education in America - potency scale	0.47	0.01	0.48
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	2.26	0.03	2.13
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	0.41	0.06	2.04
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	1.86	0.15	2.93
Teacher home visits - potency scale	0.35	0.01	4.15*
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	1.99	0.17	4.16*
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	2.37	0.0008	0.95

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year and student sex categories for the curriculum issues concept and revealed that both categories agreed with the concept. Female students agreed less with the concept than male students and obtained the higher mean score. Sophomore students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by juniors agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between sophomores and seniors. No significant differences were detected between the other class comparisons.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year categories for the community support of education concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Sophomores agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by juniors agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between sophomores and seniors. No significant differences were detected between the other class comparisons.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year and student sex categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the students at Mason City High School concept and revealed that both categories agreed with the concept. Female students agreed less with the concept than male students and obtained the higher mean score. Sophomore students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by juniors agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between sophomores and seniors and between juniors and seniors. No differences were detected for the other class comparisons.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year and student sex categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and

revealed that both categories disagreed with the concept. Male students disagreed more with the concept than female students and obtained the higher mean score. Junior students disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by sophomores disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by seniors disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between juniors and seniors. No differences were detected between the other classes.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year and student sex categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept teachers at Mason City High School and revealed that both categories agreed with the concept. Female students agreed less with the concept than male students and obtained the higher mean score. Junior students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by sophomores agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between sophomores and seniors and between juniors and seniors. No difference was detected for the comparison between sophomores and juniors.

Table 15 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between previsit teachers and post visit teachers. The analysis of variance detected no significant differences between the categories of either group for the concepts.

Table 15. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between previsit teachers and post visit teachers

Concept	Previsit teachers (N=47) Mean	SD	Post visit teachers (N=37) Mean	SD	ANOV F-value
Total education scale	72.97	4.69	73.05	5.76	0.01
Curriculum issues	10.70	1.31	10.91	1.11	0.64
Community support of education	7.19	2.25	7.29	2.20	0.04
Community pressures	15.87	1.74	16.10	1.80	0.36
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	12.91	5.39	12.83	4.01	0.005
Mason City High School - potency scale	17.89	3.40	18.48	3.32	0.64
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	14.31	4.06	14.32	3.07	0.00
Students at MCHS - potency scale	20.42	2.97	21.18	3.33	1.22
Education in America - evaluative scale	18.00	5.17	18.54	5.02	0.23
Education in America - potency scale	20.68	4.78	20.73	3.91	0.003
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	15.48	4.27	15.91	3.71	0.23
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	21.08	3.44	21.64	3.68	0.52
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	15.06	5.49	13.54	4.22	1.94
Teacher home visits - potency scale	21.76	4.03	20.78	3.39	1.40
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	13.23	3.88	13.73	3.76	0.34
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	19.59	4.09	20.73	3.70	1.72

Table 16 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data for comparisons between previsit parents and post visit parents. The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between previsit and post visit parents on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the Mason City High School concept and revealed that both groups agreed with the concept. Post visit parents agreed less with the concept than previsit parents and obtained the higher mean score. No significant differences were detected between the parent groups for the other concepts.

Individual tables present the analysis of variance data for comparisons between previsit parents and post visit parents, previsit parents and parents of post high school students, previsit parents and parents of junior high students, post visit parents and parents of post high school students, post visit parents and parents of junior high students, and parents of post high school students and parents of junior high students in Tables 119 through 134. Table 17 presents a summary of the analysis of variance data and indicates that no significant differences were detected between the groups.

Individual tables present the analysis of variance data for comparisons between the combined parent groups of parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, and parents of junior high school students in Appendix Tables 135 through 150. Table 18 presents a summary of the analysis of variance and indicates that no significant differences were detected between the groups for the concepts evaluated.

Table 16. Summary of the analysis of variance F values for comparisons between previsit parents and post visit parents

	Previsit parents (N=50)		Post visit parents (N=81)		ANOV
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-value
Total education scale	71.88	5.02	70.87	5.18	1.19
Curriculum issues	11.16	1.25	11.30	1.17	0.46
Community support of education	7.58	2.37	7.64	2.44	0.02
Community pressures	15.12	2.43	15.53	1.91	1.15
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	12.58	3.89	14.69	5.46	5.67**
Mason City High School - potency scale	18.90	3.50	19.27	4.09	0.28
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	14.90	3.72	16.43	5.19	3.29
Students at MCHS - potency scale	20.76	3.10	20.95	3.89	0.09
Education in America - evaluative scale	15.86	3.95	16.39	5.33	0.37
Education in America - potency scale	20.12	3.93	19.58	4.43	0.49
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	16.28	4.43	16.14	4.72	0.02
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	21.62	4.08	22.48	4.73	1.13
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	15.28	4.96	16.46	8.06	0.88
Teacher home visits - potency scale	23.30	4.50	24.29	5.31	1.22
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	13.48	4.07	15.12	6.09	2.84
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	20.38	4.62	21.46	4.13	1.96

Table 17. Summary of the analysis of variance F values between previsit parents and post visit parents, previsit parents and parents of post high school students, previsit parents and parents of junior high students, post visit parents and parents of post high school students, post visit parents and parents of junior high students, and parents of post high school students and parents of junior high students

Concept	ANOV F-value
Total education scale	0.58
Curriculum issues	1.47
Community support of education	1.01
Community pressures	0.96
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	2.93
Mason City High School - potency scale	0.62
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	1.21
Students at MCHS - potency scale	1.85
Education in America - evaluative scale	1.03
Education in America - potency scale	0.41
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	0.40
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	1.42
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	1.00
Teacher home visits - potency scale	1.36
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	1.48
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.83

Table 18. Summary of the analysis of variance F values between the combined parent groups of parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, and parents of junior high students

Concept	ANOV F-value
Total education scale	0.35
Curriculum issues	2.05
Community support of education	1.51
Community pressures	0.89
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	1.48
Mason City High School - potency scale	0.81
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.19
Students at MCHS - potency scale	2.75
Education in America - evaluative scale	1.38
Education in America - potency scale	0.37
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	0.60
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	1.54
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	1.03
Teacher home visits - potency scale	1.38
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	0.67
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.25

Individual tables present the analysis of variance data for comparisons between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students in Appendix Tables 151 through 166. Table 19 presents a summary of the analysis of variance and the Scheffe test results.

The analysis of variance test detected 10 highly significant differences, two significant differences, and four nonsignificant differences for the concepts. The Scheffe test detected 24 highly significant differences and 10 significant differences between the categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by previsit parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing still less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, and a significant difference between previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the categories for the other comparisons.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and

Table 19. Summary of the analysis of variance F values between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students

Concept	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
		T/PVP[a]	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Total education scale	7.47**	n.s.	n.s.	10.39**	n.s.	3.11*	n.s.
Curriculum issues	4.41**	n.s.	n.s.	4.93**	n.s.	n.s.	3.78**
Community support of education	29.99**	n.s.	n.s.	27.40**	n.s.	14.18**	28.41**
Community pressures	18.44**	n.s.	2.90*	25.48**	n.s.	5.91**	7.91**
Mason City High School-evaluative scale	13.27**	n.s.	n.s.	12.82**	n.s.	10.37**	7.93**
Mason City High School-potency scale	1.59	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Students at MCHS--evaluative scale	23.21**	n.s.	n.s.	25.93**	n.s.	13.92**	13.95**
Students at MCHS-potency scale	1.29	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Education in America-evaluative scale	3.32*	3.10*	3.53*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Education in America-potency scale	2.79*	n.s.	n.s.	3.90**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents of MCHS students-evaluative scale	7.19**	n.s.	n.s.	8.13**	n.s.	3.62*	4.86**
Parents of MCHS students-potency scale	0.79	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teacher home visits-evaluative scale	16.85**	n.s.	3.06*	20.88**	n.s.	10.55**	5.35**
Teacher home visits-potency scale	13.40**	2.87*	4.15*	19.70**	n.s.	4.37**	3.46*
Teachers at MCHS--evaluative scale	4.55**	n.s.	n.s.	5.13**	n.s.	3.45*	n.s.
Teachers at MCHS-potency scale	1.02	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

[a]T/PVP = teachers/previsit parents
T/PNHSS = teachers/parents of nonhigh school students
T/S = teachers/students
PVP/PNHSS = previsit parents/parents of nonhigh school students
PVP/S = previsit parents/students
PNHSS/S = parents of nonhigh school students/students.

obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between parents of nonhigh school students and students, teachers and students, and previsit parents and students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that three categories disagreed with the community pressures concept and that one category agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the

highest mean score, and were followed by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by previsit parents disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the third highest mean score. Students agreed with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected three highly significant differences and one significant difference between the categories. The highly significant differences occurred between teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and previsit parents and students. The significant difference was detected between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the Mason City High School concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by previsit parents agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, previsit parents and students, and parents of nonhigh school students and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the students at Mason City High School concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by previsit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept education in America and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept.

Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by previsit parents agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students and between teachers and previsit

parents. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the concept education in America and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and that all other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept parents of Mason City High School students and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students, and a significant

difference between previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by previsit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, previsit parents and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students. A significant difference was detected between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that three categories agreed with the concept and one category disagreed with the concept.

Parents of nonhigh school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, followed by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean

score. Students disagreed with the concept and obtained the highest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students and between previsit parents and students. Significant differences were detected between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and between teachers and previsit parents. No significant difference was detected between previsit parents and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept teachers at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by previsit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

All other concepts not included in the description were not significant for the analysis of variance or the Scheffe test.

The Scheffe test revealed that differences were frequently between student and adult groups. Twenty-eight of the 34, or slightly over 82

percent, of the Scheffe test values occurred between students and another group such as teachers, previsit parents, or parents of a nonhigh school student. The remaining Scheffe test values were detected between teachers and parent groups, teachers and previsit parents or between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students.

Individual tables present the analysis of variance data for comparisons between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students in Appendix Tables 167 through 182. Table 20 presents a summary of the analysis of variance and Scheffe test results. No significant differences were detected for the analysis of variance or Scheffe tests between the various groups for concepts not included in the description.

The analysis of variance detected nine highly significant differences, two significant differences, and no significant differences for five concepts. The Scheffe test revealed that most of the highly significant differences and most of the significant differences occurred as a result of student participation in the investigation. Approximately 81 percent, or 25 of the 31 Scheffe test values, occurred as a result of a comparison between either students and teachers, students and the post visit parents group, or students and the parents of a nonhigh school student group. Further examination of the Scheffe test values revealed that 10 highly significant differences occurred between teachers and students, six highly significant differences and one significant difference occurred between post visit parents and students, and seven highly significant differences and one significant difference occurred between parents of nonhigh school students and students.

Table 20. Summary of the analysis of variance F values between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students

Concept	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/PSVP[a]	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Total education scale	6.95**	3.11*	n.s.	10.42**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Curriculum issues	4.86**	n.s.	n.s.	5.14**	n.s.	n.s.	3.94**
Community support of education	30.66**	n.s.	n.s.	27.50**	n.s.	19.09**	28.49**
Community pressures	22.65**	n.s.	3.13*	27.53**	n.s.	16.49**	8.56**
Mason City High School-evaluative scale	9.91**	n.s.	n.s.	11.98**	n.s.	2.87*	7.41**
Mason City High School-potency scale	1.81	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Students at MCHS-evaluative scale	19.66**	3.27*	n.s.	24.39**	n.s.	7.85**	13.12**
Students at MCHS-potency scale	1.30	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Education in America-evaluative scale	2.75*	n.s.	3.35*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Education in America-potency scale	2.51	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents of MCHS students-evaluative scale	7.78**	n.s.	n.s.	8.25**	n.s.	5.80**	4.93**
Parents of MCHS students-potency scale	1.47	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teacher home visits-evaluative scale	14.04**	n.s.	n.s.	18.67**	n.s.	8.07**	4.78**
Teacher home visits-potency scale	12.56**	8.02**	3.87**	18.35**	n.s.	8.07**	4.78**
Teachers at MCHS-evaluative scale	3.38*	n.s.	n.s.	4.80**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teachers at MCHS-potency scale	1.61	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

[a]T/PSVP = teachers/post visit parents
T/PNHSS = teachers/parents of nonhigh school students
T/S = teachers/students
PSVP/PNHSS = post visit parents/parents of nonhigh school students
PSVP/S = post visit parents/students
PNHSS/S = parents of nonhigh school students/students.

The analysis of variance test detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between teachers and post visit parents. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance test detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with

the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students, teachers and students, and between post visit parents and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that three categories disagreed with the community pressures concept and one category agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by post visit parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Students agreed with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed three highly significant differences and one significant difference between the categories. The highly significant differences were detected between teachers and students, post visit parents and students, and between parents of nonhigh school students and students. The significant difference was detected for the comparison between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and a significant difference between post visit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept students at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students,

and post visit parents and students. A significant difference was detected between teachers and post visit parents. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept education in America and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by post visit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. All comparisons between the other categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept parents of Mason City High School students and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by post visit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between

teachers and students, post visit parents and students, and between parents of nonhigh school students and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that teachers and parents of nonhigh school students agreed with the concept, and that post visit parents and students disagreed with the concept. Parents of nonhigh school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the higher mean score, and were followed by teachers agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score. Students disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score, and were followed by post visit parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, post visit parents and students, teachers and post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. No significant difference was detected between post visit parents and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept teachers at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept.

Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more

with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

Individual tables present the analysis of variance data for comparisons between the combined groups of teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students in Appendix Tables 183 through 198. Table 21 presents a summary of the analysis of variance and Scheffe test results.

The analysis of variance detected nine highly significant differences, two significant differences, and no significant differences for five concepts. The Scheffe test revealed 10 highly significant differences between teachers and students, 13 highly significant differences and four significant differences between students and parent groups.

Further examination of the Scheffe test values revealed that seven highly significant differences occurred between students and high school parents, four highly significant differences and one significant difference occurred between students and post high parents, two highly significant differences and three significant differences occurred between students and junior high parents, and two highly significant differences and three significant differences occurred between teachers and parent groups. All other comparisons were not significant.

Table 21. Summary of the analysis of variance F values between combined groups of teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high students, parents of junior high students, and students

Concept	ANOV F-value	T/HSP[a]	T/PHP	T/JHP
Total education scale	5.59**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Curriculum issues	3.77**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Community support of education	24.42**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.*
Community pressures	16.47**	n.s.	n.s.	2.45
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	9.15**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Mason City High School - potency scale	1.54	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	16.65**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Students at MCHS - potency scale	1.62	n.s.*	n.s.*	n.s.
Education in America - evaluative scale	3.24*	2.52*	2.93*	n.s.
Education in America - potency scale	2.10	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	6.59**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	1.25	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	12.52**	n.s.	n.s.**	n.s.
Teacher home visits - potency scale	10.01**	5.11**	8.14**	n.s.
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	3.13*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	0.86	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

[a]T/HSP = teachers/parents of high school students
T/PHP = teachers/parents of post high students
T/JHP = teachers/parents of junior high students
T/S = teachers/students
HSP/PHP = parents of high school students/parents of post high students
HSP/JHP = parents of high school students/parents of junior high students
HSP/S = parents of high school students/students
PHP/JHP = parents of post high students/parents of junior high students
PHP/S = parents of post high students/students
JHP/S = parents of junior high students/students.

Scheffe Test F-Value						
T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
7.06**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
3.54**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
18.66**	n.s.	n.s.	17.82**	n.s.	10.02**	12.55**
17.61**	n.s.	n.s.	11.53**	n.s.	4.41**	2.45*
8.40**	n.s.	n.s.	5.73**	n.s.	4.81**	n.s.
n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
17.11**	n.s.	n.s.	10.78**	n.s.	4.25**	6.43**
n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
5.76**	n.s.	n.s.	5.24**	n.s.	2.77*	n.s.
n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
13.27**	n.s.	n.s.	9.51**	n.s.	n.s.	3.05*
12.40**	n.s.	n.s.	83.72**	n.s.	n.s.	2.99*
3.41**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

The following descriptions present the results for each concept evaluated by the individual groups reported in Table 21. Concepts not included in the description were not significant for the analysis of variance or the Scheffe tests.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of post high school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students disagreeing still less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high school students disagreeing still less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of post high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of junior

high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, parents of junior high students and students, and between parents of post high school students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that three categories disagreed with the community pressures concept and that two categories agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents of high school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean

score, and by parents of post high school students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Parents of junior high school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and were followed by students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test detected three highly significant differences and two significant differences between the categories. The highly significant differences occurred between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, and parents of post high students and students. The significant differences occurred between teachers and parents of junior high students and parents of junior high students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the Mason City High School concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students,

and between parents of post high school students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept students at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of post high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, parents of junior high students and students, and between parents of post high school students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the education in America concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high students agreeing still more with the concept

and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a significant difference between teachers and parents of post high school students and a significant difference between teachers and parents of high school students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept parents of Mason City High School students and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between parents of high school students and students. A significant difference was revealed between parents of post high school students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents of post high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between parents of high school students and students. A significant difference was revealed between parents of junior high students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that teachers, parents of high school students, and parents of junior high school students agreed with the concept and that parents of post high school students and students disagreed with the concept. Parents of high school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

Students disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and parents of post high school students disagreed less with the concept and obtained the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents of high school students and students, teachers and students, teachers and parents of post high school students, and between teachers and parents of high school students. A significant difference was detected between parents of junior high school students and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept teachers at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of post high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

Individual tables present the analysis of variance data for comparisons between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students in Appendix Tables 199 through 214. Table 22 presents a summary of the analysis of variance and Scheffe test results.

Table 22. Summary of the analysis of variance F values between combined groups of teachers, parents, and students

Concept	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P[a]	T/S	P/S
Total education scale	10.89**	6.86**	21.26**	7.05**
Curriculum issues	5.62**	n.s.	10.60**	4.65*
Community support of education	47.52**	n.s.	55.93**	79.75**
Community pressures	31.97**	6.27**	52.83**	38.50**
Mason City High School - evaluative scale	17.01**	n.s.	25.17**	23.89**
Mason City High School - potency scale	2.18	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Students at MCHS - evaluative scale	33.26**	4.23*	51.53**	44.14**
Students at MCHS - potency scale	0.63	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Education in America -- evaluative scale	5.31**	9.54**	n.s.	4.50*
Education in America -- potency scale	3.86*	3.18*	7.72**	n.s.
Parents of MCHS students - evaluative scale	12.78**	n.s.	17.32**	19.52**
Parents of MCHS students - potency scale	0.82	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teacher home visits - evaluative scale	24.18**	4.67**	39.83**	29.21**
Teacher home visits - potency scale	18.54**	15.70**	37.15**	301.70**
Teachers at MCHS - evaluative scale	5.79**	n.s.	10.27**	5.98**
Teachers at MCHS - potency scale	1.49	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

[a]T/P = teachers/parents
T/S = teachers/students
P/S = parents/students.

The analysis of variance detected 11 highly significant differences, one significant difference, and no significant differences for four concepts. The Scheffe test revealed 11 highly significant differences between teachers and students, nine highly significant differnces and two significant differences between parents and students, and five highly significant differences and two significant differences between teachers and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

The following descriptions report the results for each concept evaluated by the individual groups presented in Table 22. Concepts not included in the descriptions were not significant for the analysis of variance or the Scheffe tests.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents and students, and teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by

teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents and students and a highly significant difference between teachers and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that two categories disagreed with the community pressures concept and that one category agreed with the concept. Teachers and parents disagreed with the concept and students agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and were followed by parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents and students, and teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the Mason City High School concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept students at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents and students. A significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

for the education in America concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and parents and a significant difference between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and students.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the education in America concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between teachers and parents. No significant difference was detected between parents and students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept parents of Mason City High School students and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by

parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents and students and between teachers and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents and students, and teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the teacher home visits concept and revealed that two categories agreed with the concept and that one category disagreed with the concept. Teachers and parents agreed with the concept and students disagreed with the concept. Parents agreed least with the concept and obtained the higher mean score, and were followed by teachers agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score. Students disagreed with the concept and obtained the highest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between parents and students, teachers and students, and teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the concept teachers at Mason City High School and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

An interpretation of the results is presented for each concept and for each group in the Discussion chapter.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the attitude of teachers, parents and students toward teacher home visits and other educational topics in an Iowa school district.

A review of literature revealed that very little recent or significant research exists concerning the topic. Most literature reviewed was subject oriented and frequently represented individual case studies which were generally anecdotal and without statistical support.

Home visits and other forms of home-school contact were quite popular during the 1920's, 30's and 40's, and were frequently associated with a social occasion. Home visitation all but subsided during the 1950's and 60's, and it was determined that research should be conducted in a district for an entire school to evaluate the attitudes of the respondents during the 1970's.

Mason City High School is considered innovative and, in 1972, the faculty and administration initiated a home-school contact project entitled Outreach - MCHS (More Contact Home and School). The purpose of the project was to examine the effectiveness of the educational program by sharing successful and effective ideas with faculty members and to obtain parent involvement.

Project Outreach - MCHS was developed so faculty members could explain, in the parental home of the students, the school's objectives, educational philosophy, programs of study and policies. The faculty members also provided any additional information, as determined by the scope of the visit, concerning the school, its programs and future career or higher education opportunities for the student.

As a result of the project an assessment was considered relevant for future consideration by administrators, faculty, parents and students. It was hoped that this research could determine the attitudes and opinions of those individuals included in the investigation toward teacher home visits and other educational topics.

As a result five questions were asked:

1. Is there a significant difference among various groups in their opinions toward education as measured by the Education Scale?

2. Is there a significant difference in opinion among various groups on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire?

3. Is there a significant difference among various groups in opinion as measured by the semantic differential toward the following concepts?

   A. A public high school
   B. Students at a public high school
   C. Education in America
   D. Parents of public high school students
   E. Teacher home visits
   F. Teachers at a public high school

4. Is there a significant difference in opinion between teacher groups as measured by the Education Scale, on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, or as measured by the semantic differential when the demographic variables of sex, age, degree and experience are considered?

5. Is there a significant difference in opinion between student groups as measured by the Education Scale on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire or as measured by the semantic differential when the demographic variables of sex and class are considered?

A three part investigative questionnaire was developed from existing instruments and incorporated, totally or partially, from the Education Scale, Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and semantic differential technique. A description and discussion of the concept results follow a heading denoting each concept evaluated by the various groups.

Education Scale Concept

The Education Scale comprised the first section of the questionnaire and the analysis of variance detected eight highly significant differences and one significant difference between the respondent categories.

Teacher age variable

Comparison of teacher results by age categories for the total Education Scale concept revealed that teachers under 30 years old disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score. Teachers 30 through 39 disagreed less with the concept and obtained the next highest mean score, while teachers 40 years old and older disagreed least with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers 30 through 39 years of age and teachers 40 years old and older, and between teachers under 30 years of age and teachers 40 years old and older. No significant difference was detected between teachers under 30 years old and 30 through 39 years old.

The results indicate that the youngest teachers and the mid-age range teachers share a similar opinion of the concept as compared with the oldest teachers. The assumption that the differences resulted primarily from traditional differences associated with youth and age should not be discounted.

Teacher degree variable

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the teacher degree categories and revealed that all degree categories

disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Bachelor degree teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the higher mean score while teachers possessing a master's degree, or above, disagreed less with the concept and obtained the lower mean score.

Mason City High School teaching experience variable

Comparison of teacher experience results revealed that all MCHS teaching experience categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers with three years or less MCHS experience disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score. Teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience disagreed less with the concept and obtained the next highest mean score, while teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience disagreed least with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between the least experienced and most experienced MCHS teachers and a highly significant difference between teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience and teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience. No significant difference was detected between teachers with three years or less MCHS experience and teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience.

Total teaching experience variable

Comparison of the results for total teaching experience revealed a response pattern similar to the MCHS teaching experience variable in that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers with five years or less total experience disagreed most with the concept

and obtained the highest mean score. Teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience disagreed less with the concept and obtained the next highest mean score, while teachers with 15 or more years total experience disagreed least with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers with five years or less total experience and teachers with 15 years or more total experience and a highly significant difference between teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience and teachers with 15 or more years total experience. No significant difference was detected between teachers with five years or less total experience and teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience.

Teacher variable summary

Eight highly significant differences and one significant difference were detected between the variable categories for the total Education Scale.

The results indicated that the youngest least experienced teachers, generally with a bachelor's degree, disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean scores, while the oldest most experienced teachers generally with a master's degree, or above, disagreed less with the concept and obtained the lower mean scores.

The results illustrate the traditional differences usually associated with comparisons between categories of age, degrees, and experience. The results should not be considered unique but should be regarded as an expected occurrence within a balanced independent faculty.

It should be further noted that response patterns for the variables

of age, MCHS experience, and total experience are quite similar, with the first level and middle level of the variable being highly significantly different from the last level, and with no difference being found between the first two levels. This pattern should be expected, however, because teacher age, MCHS experience, and total experience are related variables.

Students

A highly significant difference was detected between the sexes on the total Education Scale and revealed that both sexes disagreed with the concept. Female students disagreed most with the concept and obtained the higher mean score while male students disagreed less with the concept and obtained the lower mean score. No particular reason or specific conclusions are offered for the results obtained between the sexes.

Other group comparisons

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference for the comparison between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students. A highly significant difference was also detected for the comparison between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students for the total Education Scale concept.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by previsit parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the

next highest mean score and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the categories for the other Scheffe test comparisons.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students for the total Education Scale concept and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by post visit parents disagreeing still less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between teachers and post visit parents. No significant differences were detected between the other categories for the Scheffe test.

Other group comparisons summary

The results for both previsit and post visit parent groups may have occurred due to the varied experiences and overall knowledge of the concept as perceived by the evaluating groups. Knowledge of the profession and general experience with the concept may account for the highly

significant differences between teachers and students. The significant difference between previsit parents and students may be representative of age and experience for parents. The results for the various group comparisons with students likely occurred due to the differences in age and experience between the groups and students. The investigation failed to identify a reason for the significant difference between teachers and post visit parents and no explanation is offered.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference on the total Education Scale between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students and revealed that all categories disagreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, and were followed in rank order by post high parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by high school parents disagreeing still less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students. All other comparisons were not significant.

Most differences may be attributed to teacher-student and parent-student comparisons and the results should not be considered unusual. The greatest number of significant or highly significant differences usually occurred for comparisons between a particular group and students. Similar groups tended to obtain similar scores and comparisons between similar groups generally revealed results which were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference

between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students and revealed that all categories disagreed with the total Education Scale concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents and students, and teachers and parents.

The results revealed that scores were frequently representative of specific groups. Teachers reacted to and evaluated the concept as a group of teachers, parents as a group of parents, and students as a group of students. Comparisons between similar groups, such as parents and teachers, were frequently not significant. Comparisons between dissimilar groups, such as students and parents or students and teachers, frequently found students reacting with both groups and, therefore, the number of significant or highly significant differences was increased. The number of significant differences suggests that comparisons between students, teachers, and parents may represent individual or group biases and the evaluations may be influenced by age, experience, or authority.

Subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

Three subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire comprised the second section of the questionnaire and the analysis of variance detected 14 highly significant differences and four significant differences between the respondent categories.

Curriculum issues concept

The analysis of variance failed to detect significant differences between teacher groups for the variable categories of sex, age, degree, and teaching experience. The analysis of variance also failed to detect significant differences between various parent groups. Four highly significant differences were obtained for comparisons between various parent groups, teachers, and students. One significant difference was obtained for the student class year and student sex comparison.

Students

A significant difference was detected between student class year and student sex for the curriculum issues concept and revealed that both categories agreed with the concept. Female students agreed less with the concept than male students and obtained the higher mean score. Sophomore students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by juniors agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between sophomores and seniors. No significant differences were detected between the other class comparisons.

Student reaction to the curriculum issues concept should not be considered unusual. The sophomore student mean score may be attributed to their youth, inexperience, and recent exposure to the high school system and curriculum. The individual and group mean scores of the

upperclassmen may represent their experience, knowledge, and understanding of the curriculum issues concept within the school system.

Other group comparisons

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students. A highly significant difference was also detected between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students for the curriculum issues concept.

For the comparison between previsit parents and the other groups the analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant for the Scheffe test.

For the comparison between post visit parents and the other groups the analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum

issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students. All comparisons between the other categories were not significant for the Scheffe test.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, parents of nonhigh school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of post high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of junior high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students. All comparisons between the other categories were not significant for the Scheffe test.

The differences obtained between teachers and students may have occurred due to the frequent group contact and proximity of each group to the educational environment and may have influenced the interpretation of the concept for each group. The results obtained for comparisons between students and parents of nonhigh school students are understandable since those parents would be somewhat removed from the current educational environment and probably not as familiar with the current curriculum issues.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

The concept results indicate that differences frequently occurred as a result of the inclusion of student data and comparisons between parent and teacher data.

Group comparisons summary

The difference in opinion detected between teachers and students and between parents of nonhigh school students and students may be due to the

teachers' experience, education, and familiarity with the concept terminology as contrasted to the students' inexperience, age, and education. The comparison between parents of nonhigh school students and students may be considered somewhat differently since comparisons were between relatively inexperienced groups. Parents were relatively inexperienced in terms of familiarity with a student's high school curriculum and students in terms of age and experience. Many parents of nonhigh school students may have responded to the concept in reference to their own high school experiences, experiences of students recently graduated, information based on opinions of current students, or to hearsay from other sources. Informing particular parental groups about the curriculum is suggested and should be encouraged and implemented through a special effort as determined by the administration. A method of providing current educational information concerning the high school curriculum should be initiated and included with other pertinent information late in the ninth grade or during the summer previous to the sophomore year.

Community support of education concept

The analysis of variance detected six highly significant differences and two significant differences between the various groups for the community support of education concept. Comparisons between teacher groups revealed highly significant differences for the variables of age and MCHS experience, while a significant difference was detected for the total teaching experience variable. The other highly significant and significant differences occurred for comparisons between other groups.

Teacher age variable

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the teacher age categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Teachers under 30 years old agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by teachers 30 through 39 agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers 40 years old and older agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed that all comparisons between the teacher age categories were highly significant.

Mason City High School teaching experience variable

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the MCHS teaching experience categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers with three years or less MCHS experience agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between the least experienced and the most experienced MCHS teachers and a highly significant difference between teachers with three years or less MCHS experience and teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience.

No significant difference was detected between teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience and teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience.

Total teaching experience

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the total teaching experience categories and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers with five years or less total teaching experience agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by teachers with 6 through 14 years total experience agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers with 15 or more years total experience agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers with five years or less total experience and teachers with 15 or more years total experience. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

Teacher variable summary

The results for the variables of age, MCHS teaching experience, and total teaching experience should not be considered unusual. The pattern of the highest mean score being achieved by the youngest and least experienced teacher groups as compared with the lowest mean score being obtained by the oldest and most experienced teacher groups emphasizes traditional divisions frequently associated between the groups, and Scheffe test results substantiated the differences by the values obtained.

There are, however, additional aspects which must be considered for the concept and for this particular investigation. Mason City is a fairly conservative community whose educational system has been readily and frequently supported through the years. Residents take pride in a well supported education system which is progressive and open to prudent suggestions but not quickly or frequently altered. Therefore, the teacher response results for the community support of education concept may indicate that the youngest and least experienced teachers are not fully aware of the community support given to the school system while the oldest and most experienced teachers are more cognizant of this support.

Students

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between student class years for the community support of education concept and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Sophomores agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by juniors agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between sophomores and seniors and no significant differences between the other class comparisons.

The student results may indicate that as a student matures and gains educational experience, he becomes more cognizant of the educational support received from the community. Differences in student opinion tend

to be greatest between senior and sophomore students and are likely due to age, maturity, experience, and educational awareness.

Other group comparisons

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between parents of nonhigh school students and students, teachers and students, and previsit parents and students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students, teachers and students, and post visit parents and students. Comparisons between all other categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents of nonhigh school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, parents of junior high students and students, and parents of post high school students and students. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students and revealed that all categories agreed with the community support of education concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained

the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents and students and between teachers and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

Other group comparisons summary

The concept results indicate that student data do not necessarily reflect the opinions of a teacher group or a parental group. Students may be reacting to isolated incidents, within the concept, and not to the total concept. Therefore, their responses may represent the reactive evaluations of youth and inexperience in several areas.

The Scheffe results revealed that the differences occurred between parents and students and between teachers and students, and not between parents and teachers. The results suggest that teachers and parents are aware of the community support of education and that students are basing their evaluations on other information.

Community pressures concept

The analysis of variance detected four highly significant differences and one significant difference between the various groups for the community pressures concept.

Mason City High School teaching experience variable

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the MCHS teaching experience categories and revealed that all categories

disagreed with the concept. Teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers with three years or less MCHS experience disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers with three years of less MCHS experience and teachers with four through nine years experience. No significant differences were detected between teachers with four through nine years MCHS experience and teachers with 10 or more years MCHS experience.

Teacher variable summary

Explanation of the differences between teachers in the mid-range of MCHS teaching experience and teachers with the least MCHS teaching experience may be subject to conjecture. Teachers with the least MCHS teaching experience may have insufficient experience to have concluded that specific community pressures have been encountered, whereas teachers with the most MCHS teaching experience indicate certain community pressures have been experienced. Teachers in the mid-range of MCHS teaching experience may be near the range extremes of the least experienced and most experienced categories and either tended to fractionalize the group, or sufficient teachers in the mid-range of MCHS teaching experience may be uncertain of the conditions constituting community pressures and vacillated.

Other group comparisons

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students and revealed that three categories disagreed with the community pressures concept and that one category agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by previsit parents disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Students agreed with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and previsit parents and students. The Scheffe test also revealed a significant difference between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students and revealed that three categories disagreed with the community pressures concept, and that one category agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by post visit parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by parents of nonhigh school students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Students agreed with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, post visit parents and students, and parents of nonhigh school students and students. The significant difference was detected between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students and revealed that three categories disagreed with the community pressures concept and two categories agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by parents of post high school students disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Parents of junior high students agreed less with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and students agreed more with the concept and obtained the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, and parents of post high school students and students. The significant differences occurred between teachers and parents of junior high students and between parents of junior high students and students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students and revealed that teachers and parents disagreed with community pressures concept and that students agreed with the concept. Teachers disagreed

more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and parents disagreed less with the concept and obtained the lower mean score. Students agreed with the concept and obtained the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students, parents and students, and teachers and parents.

Other group comparisons summary

The results indicate that teachers and parent groups do not believe that community pressures exist on the teachers or on the school system, but community pressures are believed to exist by students. Students as compared with teachers and parents may not be totally aware of the foundations of the community power structure and the elements constituting community pressures. No detailed inquiry is suggested by the faculty or administration to ascertain what pressures are believed to exist in the community by students.

The Semantic Differential

The semantic differential comprised the third section of the questionnaire and the analysis of variance detected 24 highly significant and 10 significant differences between the categories.

Mason City High School concept

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between previsit parents and post visit parents on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that both groups agreed with the concept. Post visit parents agreed less with the concept than previsit parents and obtained the higher mean score. All other concept

comparisons between previsit parents and post visit parents were not significant. The results may indicate that parents of current high school students based their evaluation of the concept on a criterion distinctly separate from the other groups. A follow-up investigation may be warranted and further study may be justified.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept.

Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by previsit parents agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, previsit parents and students, and parents of nonhigh school students and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh

school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and parents of nonhigh school students and students, and a significant difference between post visit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories for the Scheffe test.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, and between parents of post high school students and students. No other comparisons between the categories were significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all

categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a highly significant difference between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

No significant differences occurred for the concept on the potency scale of the semantic differential for any comparisons between the respective groups.

Mason City High School concept summary

For the concept all comparisons which revealed either significant differences or highly significant differences occurred between students and some other group on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential. No significant differences were detected between teachers and parent groups and the results indicate that the concept was evaluated by the two groups as collective adult members of the community and not specifically or individually as teachers or parents. The results between students and adult groups likely represent the traditional differences frequently associated between adults with years of varied experiences and in positions of authority as contrasted with students lacking experience, continuing their education, and establishing new learning experiences.

Students at Mason City High School concept

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between student class year and student sex on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that both categories agreed with the concept. Female students agreed less with the concept than male students and obtained the higher mean score. Sophomore students agreed least with the concept and were followed in rank order by juniors agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between sophomores and seniors and a significant difference between juniors and seniors. No significant difference was detected between sophomores and juniors.

Students summary

Only comparisons between students were significant and should be expected for a concept involving peer evaluation. No significant differences were detected between teacher and parent groups for the concept.

Analysis of student data revealed that class mean scores followed lines of class rank with sophomores agreeing least with the concept and obtaining the highest mean score and seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. The results indicate that the senior and junior class responses were based on the benefit of their total high school experience, whereas the sophomore class responses were based on inexperience with the high school, their current experiences, or anticipated experiences.

Other comparison groups

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by previsit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences for comparisons between teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected for comparisons between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score, followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between

teachers and students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, post visit parents and students, and a significant difference between teachers and post visit parents. No significant differences were detected between the other categories for the Scheffe test. The Scheffe test comparison between teachers and previsit parents was not significant and no particular explanation is offered for the results.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of post high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents of high school students and students, parents of junior high students and students, and parents of post high school students and students. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all

categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between parents and students, and a significant difference between teachers and parents.

Students at Mason City High School concept summary

The results should not be considered unusual since students, teachers, and parents would usually be expected to respond quite differently to the concept. Evaluation and responses to the concept may have occurred as a result of generation differences as much, or perhaps more, than any specific reaction to any one issue within the concept.

For the concept all significant and highly significant differences occurred on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential while all comparisons between all groups were not significant on the potency scale.

Education in America concept

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still

more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by previsit parents agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students and between teachers and previsit parents. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students. All comparisons between the other categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next

highest mean score, by post visit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. All comparisons between the other categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test detected a significant difference between teachers and parents of post high school students and between teachers and students. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the

concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by parents agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and parents and a significant difference between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and students.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Teachers agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining and next highest mean score and by students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between teachers and parents. No significant difference was revealed between parents and students.

Education in America concept summary

Interpretation of the concept results for both scales of the semantic differential may be representative of an evaluation of the concept by professional educators as compared to the evaluation of the concept by a group of lay persons. A comparison of the student values

as contrasted with the parent and teacher values indicates that students may lack the experience and knowledge to fully assess the concept. The analysis of the responses for the concept is not to be interpreted as a negative assessment of the groups but a condition attributed primarily to youth and inexperience for students and a lack of experience for the parent groups.

Parents of Mason City High School concept

All groups evaluated the concept and no significant differences were detected for the analysis of variance between teacher groups, parent groups, or students on the evaluative scale or the potency scale of the semantic differential. Four highly significant differences were detected between other specific groups on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and are described individually.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents of nonhigh school students and students, and a significant

difference between previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by post visit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, post visit parents and students, and parents of nonhigh school students and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by teachers agreeing still more with the concept and

obtaining the next highest mean score and by parents of post high school students agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between parents of high school students and students. A significant difference was revealed between parents of post high school students and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between all teachers, all parents, and all students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents and students and between teachers and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

Parents of Mason City High School students concept summary

The results indicate that while all groups agreed with the concept a difference of opinion existed between each group for the concept. Each group would be expected to respond to the concept quite differently and the results are indicative of the assertion. Student results, as an expected example, may be a reaction to parental or teacher influence and

authority as much as any adolescent influence and interpretation of the concept.

Teacher home visits concept

All groups evaluated the concept and no significant differences were detected for the analysis of variance between teacher groups, parent groups, or students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential. Highly significant differences were detected between other specific groups on both scales of the semantic differential and are described individually. A significant difference was detected between students on the potency scale for the concept.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by previsit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, previsit parents and students, and parents of nonhigh school students and students. A significant difference was revealed between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. No significant differences were detected for comparisons of other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that three categories agreed with the concept and one category disagreed with the concept.

Parents of nonhigh school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by previsit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Students disagreed with the concept and obtained the highest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students and between previsit parents and students. Significant differences were detected between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and between teachers and previsit parents. No significant difference was detected between previsit parents and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by post visit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the

next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, post visit parents and students, and between parents of nonhigh school students and students. No significant differences were detected between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that two categories agreed with the concept and that two categories disagreed with the concept. Parents of nonhigh school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and were followed by teachers agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score. Students disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and were followed by post visit parents disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students, post visit parents and students, teachers and post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students, and teachers and parents of nonhigh school students. No significant difference was detected between post visit parents and parents of nonhigh school students.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students and students on the

evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of post high school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of junior high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between high school parents and students, and a significant difference between parents of junior high students and students. No other comparisons between the categories were significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of junior high school students, parents of post high school students and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that three categories agreed with the concept and that two categories disagreed with the concept.

Parents of high school students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of junior high students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score. Students disagreed more with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and were followed by parents of post

high school students disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the lower mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between parents of high school students and students, teachers and students, teachers and parents of post high school students, and teachers and parents of high school students, and a significant difference between parents of junior high school students and students. No other comparisons between the categories were significant.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students, parents and students, and teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that teachers and parents agreed with the concept and that students disagreed with the concept. Parents agreed less with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and teachers agreed more with the concept and obtained the lower mean score. Students disagreed with the concept and obtained the highest mean score.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that teachers and parents agreed with the concept and that students disagreed with the concept. Parents agreed less with the concept and obtained the higher mean score and teachers agreed more with the concept and obtained the lower mean score. Students disagreed with the concept and obtained the highest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between parents and students, teachers and students, and teachers and parents.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year and student sex categories on the potency scale of the semantic differential and revealed that both categories disagreed with the concept. Male students disagreed more with the concept than female students and obtained the higher mean score. Junior students disagreed most with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed by sophomores disagreeing less with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by seniors disagreeing least with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a significant difference between juniors and seniors. No significant differences were detected between the other classes.

The Scheffe test results indicate, on both scales of the semantic differential, that the inclusion of student data greatly influenced results for certain areas of the investigation. The results indicate that opinion differences exist toward teacher home visits between students,

teachers, previsit parents, and parents of nonhigh school students. On the evaluative scale the significant difference between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students is of interest when compared with the nonsignificant differences between teachers and previsit parents and the nonsignificant difference between previsit parents and parents of nonhigh school students. The results indicate that teacher home visits are apparently of value to parents with students about to enter high school and in retrospect to those parents who had a student recently complete high school.

On the potency scale only the comparison between previsit parents and parents of nonhigh school students failed to have a significant difference for the Scheffe test. The Scheffe test revealed highly significant differences between teachers and students and between previsit parents and students. Significant differences were revealed between teachers and parents of nonhigh school students, students and parents of nonhigh school students, and between teachers and previsit parents.

The results between teachers and students should be expected, but the results between teachers and parent groups and between students and parent groups are of greater interest. The Scheffe values indicate that the concept is of importance to both groups and that parents may need to be more thoroughly informed about their schools.

The value and importance of the teacher home visit to the various parental groups are indicated by the Scheffe test results. The results indicate that parental groups would benefit from a teacher home visit and that information concerning the high school program should be initiated before the students begin their high school career. The

results also indicate that teachers agreed most with the concept and should be interpreted as a positive indicator for their willingness to participate in future visits. In addition, almost all teacher questionnaires were returned, whereas the parent questionnaire results may represent only those parents with a positive attitude demonstrated by returning the questionnaire.

Teachers at Mason City High School concept

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by previsit parents agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and a significant difference between previsit parents and students. No significant differences were detected for comparisons between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed

least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by post visit parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of nonhigh school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between the teachers and students. No significant differences were detected for comparisons between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between the student class year and student sex categories on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that both categories agreed with the concept. Female students agreed less with the concept than male students and obtained the higher mean score. Junior students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed by sophomores agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by seniors agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between sophomores and seniors and between juniors and seniors. No difference was detected for the comparison between sophomores and juniors.

The analysis of variance detected a significant difference between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high students, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the

highest mean score and were followed in rank order by junior high parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, by parents of post high school students agreeing still more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score, and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students. No significant differences were detected for comparisons between the other categories.

The analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the combined groups of teachers, parents, and students on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential and revealed that all categories agreed with the concept. Students agreed least with the concept and obtained the highest mean score and were followed in rank order by parents agreeing more with the concept and obtaining the next highest mean score and by teachers agreeing most with the concept and obtaining the lowest mean score.

The Scheffe test revealed a highly significant difference between teachers and students and between parents and students. No significant difference was detected between teachers and parents.

Teachers at Mason City High School concept summary

The large number of differences detected between students and adults indicates that students viewed the concepts much differently than parents or teachers. The concept results should not be totally unexpected for

comparisons between teachers and students or between parents and students and are likely due to the usual differences frequently associated between each group.

The highly significant differences between teachers and students may result from the frequent contact and frequent evaluation each group experiences with the other group. The differences between parents and students may be partially attributed to parental influence and authority or some other indirect influence frequently established through their children or other students. The majority of the comparisons between teachers and parents were not significant which may indicate that teachers and parents evaluated the concept as an adult homogeneous group and not strictly as parents or strictly as teachers and had similar opinions toward the concept.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if differences in attitude could be determined between certain groups toward teacher home visits and for other educational issues in an Iowa high school district.

The review of literature revealed a need for current research since comparatively little recent literature exists. The majority of the research literature was primarily anecdotal and generally without statistical foundation.

Five null hypotheses were considered for the investigation which included:

NH1: There is no significant difference among various groups in their opinions toward education as measured by the Education Scale.

NH2: There is no significant difference in opinion among various groups on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

NH3: There is no significant difference among various groups in opinion as measured by the semantic differential toward the following concepts:

- A. A public high school
- B. Students at a public high school
- C. Education in America
- D. Parents of public high school students
- E. Teacher home visits
- F. Teachers at a public high school.

NH4: There is no significant difference in opinion between teacher groups as measured by the Education Scale on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire or as measured by the semantic differential when the demographic variables of age, sex, degree, and experience are considered.

NH5: There is no significant difference in opinion between student groups as measured by the Education Scale on any of the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire or as measured by the semantic differential when the demographic variables of sex and class are considered.

A questionnaire consisting of three sections was developed from three investigative instruments which included the Education Scale, Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, and the semantic differential technique. Rating scales were used for each section of the instrument and each group was surveyed to determine their attitudes towards the issues considered in the investigation.

The research sample included 110 Mason City High School faculty members, 264 parents of high school students, 42 parents of post high school students, 73 parents of junior high school students, and 180 high school students for a total 699. A return of seventy-two percent was obtained for all groups, with ninety-two percent of the returned questionnaires considered usable for data analysis.

Analysis of variance was used to determine differences between groups and the Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the means of specific groups. The analysis of variance detected 46 highly significant differences and 15 significant differences between all groups for 12 of the 16 concepts. No significant differences were detected between the groups on the potency scale of the semantic differential for the remaining four concepts.

None of the five hypotheses were rejected and the results for the three sections of the investigative instrument were as follows:

1.	Education Scale	8 highly significant differences 1 significant difference
2.	Purdue Teacher Opinionaire	14 highly significant differences 4 significant differences
3.	Semantic differential	24 highly significant differences 10 significant differences

The results for the evaluative and potency scales of the semantic differential were as follows:

Evaluative scale	20 highly significant differences 7 significant differences
Potency scale	4 highly significant differences 3 significant differences

Summary tables present the results of the investigation in the Findings chapter.

The Education Scale

The analysis of variance detected one significant difference and eight highly significant differences between the various groups for the total Education Scale. Four highly significant differences were detected and one significant difference was detected between the teacher groups, while four highly significant differences were detected between the other groups. The differences between teachers and the other groups were due primarily to the somewhat dated statements comprising the Education Scale. Consequently, some individuals may have based their responses to the concept statements on a personal experience or as a result of their inclusion in, or reaction to, a particular group. Future researchers should consider using a modernized Education Scale which would be more representative of the current educational concerns, conditions, and relevant issues. The use of a revised Education Scale would most likely result in fewer significant differences between all groups.

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

For concepts comprising the second section of the instrument the analysis of variance detected 14 highly significant differences and four

significant differences between the groups for the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. Teacher and student comparisons accounted for two highly significant differences and four significant differences while 12 highly significant differences were detected between the other comparison groups.

Individually the analysis of variance detected six highly significant differences and two significant differences between the various groups for the community support of education concept and four highly significant differences and one significant difference between the various groups for both the curriculum issues concept and the community pressures concept.

Semantic differential

The analysis of variance detected 24 highly significant differences and eight significant differences between the various groups on the evaluative and potency scales. The majority of the significant and highly significant differences were detected on the evaluative scale and occurred primarily due to the higher reliability of the evaluative scale. Twenty of the 32 total differences were highly significant and occurred on the evaluative scale and four highly significant differences occurred on the potency scale. Six of the eight significant differences were detected on the evaluative scale and two significant differences were detected on the potency scale.

Two of the six total potency scale differences were significant and were detected for the concept education in America, while four highly significant differences were detected for the teacher home visit concept.

Conclusions

The investigation revealed differences between many groups but the analysis of variance results for comparisons between certain homogeneous groups were frequently not significant. Similar groups tended to evaluate the concepts similarly and therefore no significant differences were detected between the groups. No significant differences were detected between the following groups for the concepts evaluated:

Previsit and post visit teacher groups and teacher sex
Previsit teachers and post visit teachers
Individual parent groups
Combined parent groups

The results revealed that there were no differences between the groups for the concepts evaluated and that there were no advantages or disadvantages in being in a previsit or post visit group.

For the total Education Scale concept the investigation revealed that all teacher groups and teacher categories disagreed with the concept. Bachelor degree teachers with the least total teaching experience and the least MCHS teaching experience disagreed most with the concept as compared with the older more experienced teacher with an advanced degree.

For the subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire the analysis of variance detected a highly significant difference between the teacher age and MCHS teaching experience categories and a significant difference between the total teaching experience categories for the community support of education concept. The analysis of variance failed to detect a difference between the teacher groups and the teacher categories for the curriculum issues concept. The analysis of variance detected a significant difference

between the MCHS teaching experience categories for the community pressures concept.

The analysis of variance failed to detect any significant differences between the teacher groups or teacher categories for the concepts on either the evaluative or potency scales of the semantic differential.

The investigation revealed that differences in opinion between teachers were frequently between the younger least experienced teacher generally with a bachelor's degree and the older more experienced teacher generally with a master's degree, or above. Generally the least experienced teachers under 30 years of age with a bachelor's degree would disagree most or agree least with a concept as compared with the most experienced teachers over 40 years of age with a master's degree, or above.

The differences between the teacher groups indicate that the oldest teachers could relate to certain statements while the youngest teachers were further removed from the concept statements. The disparity was most noticeable for the total Education Scale concept.

The overall results for comparisons between previsit and post visit teachers revealed that there are no differences between the groups for the concepts evaluated. The differences that were detected were between specific teacher related categories such as age and experience. The results indicate that the older teacher generally has longevity within the system and is probably more aware of the support provided the school by the community through the years whereas the younger teacher may be only aware of the support provided fairly recently.

Finally, the differences detected between the categories of age, MCHS, and total teaching experience probably are indicative of the traditional differences and divisions that would likely occur between the respective groups.

The investigation revealed one highly significant difference between previsit and post visit teachers on the evaluative scale of the semantic differential for the Mason City High School concept and both categories agreed with the concept. No other differences were detected between the groups and the reason for the one difference was not apparent. The results indicate that there does not appear to be an advantage or disadvantage in being in either a previsit or post visit parent group. The results of the investigation failed to detect any differences between the other parent groups for the concepts evaluated.

Students

The analysis of variance detected one highly significant and four significant differences between the student categories for the concepts evaluated. All other comparisons between the categories were not significant.

The highly significant difference was detected between the sexes for the total Education Scale concept. The significant differences were detected between the student class years for the community support of education concept and for the student class year and student sex comparison for the curriculum issues, students at MCHS (evaluative), teacher home visits (potency), and teachers at MCHS (evaluative) concepts.

The investigation revealed that both sexes disagreed with the total

Education Scale concept, that sex and class categories agreed with the curriculum issues concept, that all classes agreed with the community support of education concept, that sex and class categories agreed with the students at MCHS evaluative concept, that sex and class categories disagreed with the home visits potency concept, and that both sex and class categories agreed with the teachers at MCHS evaluative concept.

In cases of concept agreement, females and sophomores agreed least with a concept while males and seniors agreed most with the concepts. In the case of disagreement, males and juniors disagreed most with the home visits concept while females and seniors disagreed least with the concept. No particular explanation is offered for the differences between the sexes but the differences between sophomores and seniors are likely due to experience and maturity. The difference for seniors for the home visits concept is likely due to the circumstance that seniors will not be affected by a future visit. Males and juniors would not favor a visit, for reasons of their own, with any amount of enthusiasm.

Fur future investigation, depending on the limitations, the researcher should consider using only parent and teacher data. Depending on the concepts evaluated, the use of student data may not be considered necessary, especially in situations which depend on age, experience, and maturity.

Other group comparisons

The investigation revealed that for comparisons between all other groups the analysis of variance detected differences that were significant

or highly significant for the same concept for each group except for three concepts.

The analysis of variance detected the same results for 14 concepts and different results for two concepts for comparisons between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students, and for comparisons between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students, and students. Further examination of the analysis of variance results revealed nine highly significant differences, five significant differences, and no significant differences for four concepts between the two groups for the same concepts. Different results were detected between the groups for the education in America concept and the teachers at MCHS concept.

The analysis of variance detected similar results between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students, and students. The analysis of variance detected nine highly significant differences, two significant differences, and no significant differences for five concepts between the categories.

The analysis of variance detected 11 highly significant differences, five significant differences, and no significant differences for four concepts between all teachers, parents, and students.

The overall results revealed that the majority of the differences between the groups were generally between students and parents or between students and teachers and not between teachers and parents. Opinion differences between teachers or parents were generally minor whereas students tended to disagree most or agree least with a concept and

therefore the number of significant or highly significant differences were greatly increased.

No significant differences were detected on the potency scale of the semantic differential between the categories of the various groups for the following concepts:

Mason City High School
Students at MCHS
Parents of MCHS students
Teachers at MCHS

The results likely occurred due to the higher reliability of the evaluative scale and any future study should consider appropriate concept alterations or changes in the potency scale variable factors.

Recommendations

Based on the number of differences between the groups it is recommended that in addition to the usual channels of communication an ad hoc association of parents, faculty, administrators, and students should possibly be established to consider an inquiry into the reasons for differences between the groups. The committee would collect inquiries, suggestions, and opinions of educational concern which occurred between the groups and consider the issues, express views, ask questions, offer suggestions, and answer questions which were academically sound and within established laws. The net result may provide an improved understanding of the educational issues and concerns for the various groups through an atmosphere of rapport and frequent communication.

Based on the number of student differences a greater effort should be initiated to ascertain the composite needs and concerns expressed by

students toward the concepts and future educational issues. Many differences were likely due to the traditional student-teacher and student-parent confrontations but the results suggest that only the surface of the educational issues and concerns of students were exposed. Future investigations should contain detailed information concerning teacher-student and parent-student attitudinal relationships as an effect variable for the issues being investigated by the researcher. Student information could possibly be accumulated during registration, mid-year, or near the close of the school year. An alternate consideration would be the obtaining of random student response, with faculty support, through class participation.

If the school considers conducting future home visits it is recommended that the visits be limited to include parents of current junior high school ninth grade students, parents of new students, and parents of sophomore students previously not visited. As the students advance in their high school career the value of a teacher home visit would likely diminish for all groups. The benefit of the home visit would decrease in most cases for junior and senior students, and their parents, as all groups are exposed to the high school and become familiar with the educational environment.

Visits should not be necessary on a system-wide basis for all parents, or for the entire school, after the initial freshman, new student, or optional sophomore visit. Special cases should be considered individually, for any group, regardless of the student classification but within limitation guidelines.

Limiting the visitation procedure would reduce the number of home contacts and would not be overly repetitious for faculty or parents. Some repetition would be incurred by parents with students in other class years but those cases could be included or eliminated depending on the study limitations as determined by the investigator. Some repetition would be encountered by faculty members but each visit should accomplish more, with the faculty visiting fewer homes.

Other recommendations, subject to the limitations of the investigator and the school, include a random selection of parents of sophomore, junior, senior, and post high school students to survey the opinions and attitudes concerning the current educational issues either through a home visit, a mailed questionnaire, or through parent-teacher conferences in the school.

Issues of current concern should be included in the questionnaire in an effort to elicit a greater response and increase the return rate from the sample population, particularly from parents. Suggestions for a follow-up study, with appropriate modifications, might include the issues of unscheduled time, regimentation, modular scheduling, student conduct, career goals, or any other issues deemed pertinent by the investigator at the time of the investigation.

For many lay persons the experience of being included in a study may be completely new and unique. The investigator must encourage prompt participation, emphasize the importance of accurate responses, and establish effective follow-up procedures which stress the value of participation in the investigation and the contribution to the analysis of the final results.

Additional research is recommended in the school system and similar investigations are recommended in other school districts. Collection of information from further studies would result in additional knowledge which would benefit all groups included in the investigations and other groups considering similar research. Modifications of the investigative instrument could incorporate issues particularly unique to a school, faculty, parents, students, or time.

The benefit of the investigation and the consideration of conducting future home visits may be in the addition of knowledge and an increased awareness of the educational concepts evaluated by the specific groups. The benefit of the investigation for the various groups may be in the future consideration of their opinions and goal interpretations which may be included in administrative decisions which will ultimately affect the entire educational program and may result in an improved educational environment for all concerned.

The benefit of the home visit and consideration of the educational issues and concepts lies in the self-evaluation and in outside evaluation for each group. The combination of the evaluation process allows the school to compensate for faults and institute corrective measures while encouraging successful programs to continue in excellence.

A school which recognizes that differences do exist between faculty, parents, and students, and is willing to investigate problems as they occur and offer solutions either through home visits, individual contact, conferences or other means, is taking a positive approach toward creating a school environment which offers the student a better place to learn, quality education, and remains educationally accountable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, W. Paul. Teacher home visitation. National Elementary Principal 17, No. 6 (June, 1938): 203-5.

2. Atherton, J. C. Home visitation--a means of really knowing your pupils. The Agricultural Education Magazine 28, No. 4 (Oct., 1955): 81.

3. Atherton, J. C. Visitation is still important. The Agricultural Education Magazine 38, No. 7 (Jan., 1966): 158-9.

4. Bail, Joe P. Visit your prospective Vo-Ag students. The Agricultural Education Magazine 28, No. 12 (June, 1956): 269.

5. Bentley, Ralph, and Rempel, Averno M. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue Research Foundation, 1970.

6. Brown, Robert W. Home visitations prove teacher + parent = better pupils. The School Executive 72, Pt. 1 (Nov., 1952): 46-7.

7. Burke, Louise. Home visits--a teaching asset. Education Digest 14, No. 9 (May, 1949): 18-19.

8. Burma, John H. Home visiting pays dividends. Nation's Schools 37, No. 2 (Feb., 1946): 32.

9. Cassel, Russell N. Development of a semantic differential to assess the attitude of secondary school and college students. The Journal of Experimental Education 39, No. 2 (Winter, 1970): 10-13.

10. Coyne, Lolafaye, and Holzman, Philip S. Three equivalent forms of a semantic differential inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement 26 (Autumn, 1966): 665-74.

11. Crawford, C. C., and Haines, James Clayton. Evaluating methods of contact between the school and the home. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals 16, No. 6 (July, 1937): 310-12.

12. Crow, L. D. Educational research and statistics. School and Society 29, No. 748 (Apr., 1929): 553-6.

13. Davidson, Donald Keith. A study of the effects of certain variables upon the attitudes and opinions of the citizens of a suburban community concerning their public schools. Dissertation Abstracts 20, No. 7: 2674, 1959.

14. Demak, Leonard Sidney. A study of the meanings of selected educational concepts to culturally diverse groups, using the semantic differential. Dissertation Abstracts 28A, No. 8: 2887, 1967.

15. Eastman, Wesley C. More home visits and parent interviews needed. The Agricultural Education Magazine 30, No. 12 (June, 1958): 282+.

16. Edwards, Newton. Closer relations between parents and the school in Germany. The Elementary School Journal 31, No. 7 (March, 1931): 485-87.

17. Ehrlich, Dwain Harold. Opinions of citizens, teachers, and students, about certain philosophical statements of education. Dissertation Abstracts 23, No. 10: 3683, 1962.

18. Farmer, Eugene Jack. Influence of teacher home visitation on students' achievement and their attitudes toward school. Dissertation Abstracts 30A, No. 6: 2375, 1969.

19. Glass, G. V., and Stanley, J. C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

20. Gulo, E. Vaughn. Rural students' attitudes toward their teachers. The Journal of Educational Research 62, No. 2 (Oct., 1968): 89-93.

21. Haehlen, J. K. A home visitation program. Midland Schools 65, No. 8 (Apr., 1951): 20.

22. Heath, Raymond Glenn. A semantic differential analysis of teacher characteristics as perceived by high school students in Iowa. Dissertation Abstracts 29A, No. 6: 1712, 1968.

23. Heath, Robert W., and Braund, Robert A. The structures of staff interpersonal evaluations in a selected school system. Journal of Teacher Education 15, No. 3 (Sept., 1964): 269-80.

24. Helberg, David T. Affirmative viewpoint. Should teachers be encouraged to visit pupils' homes? The Instructor 75 (Oct., 1965): 15.

25. Homant, Robert. Semantic differential ratings and the rank-ordering of values. Educational and Psychological Measurement 29 (Winter, 1969): 885-9.

26. Horn, Gunnar. Home visits. Todays Education 59, No. 6 (Sept., 1970): 44-6. Also ERIC EJ 024 538.

27. Huggett, A. J. Home visiting--an important part of public relations. Nation's Schools 14, No. 4 (Oct., 1934): 39-41.

28. Husek, T. R., and Wittrock, M. C. The dimensions of attitudes toward teachers as measured by the semantic differential. Journal of Educational Psychology 53, No. 5 (1962): 209-13.

29. Johnson, James Everett. An investigation of relationships between high school seniors' satisfaction with school and selected school, personal, and home factors. Dissertation Abstracts 31A, No. 10: 5036, 1970.

30. Kane, R. B. Minimizing order effects in semantic differentials. Educational and Psychological Measurement 31 (Spring, 1971): 137-44.

31. Kane, R. B. Semantic structural differential structure. The Journal of Experimental Education 37 (Spring, 1969): 34-7.

32. Karsian, Karl. Guidance through cooperation with the home. The Clearing House 12, No. 6 (Feb., 1938): 348-51.

33. Kerlinger, Fred, and Kaya, E. The predictive validity of scales constructed to measure attitudes toward education. Educational and Psychological Measurement 19 (1959): 305-17.

34. Khouri, John Wycliffe. The professional preparation and duties of the home and school visitor in the public schools of Pennsylvania. Dissertation Abstracts 26, No. 3: 1428, 1964.

35. Kornegay, William G. Another look at home visiting. The High School Journal 40 (Feb., 1957): 166-8.

36. Kramer, David P., and Fleming, Elyse S. Interparental differences of opinion and children's academic achievement. The Journal of Educational Research 60, No. 3 (Nov., 1966): 136-8.

37. Langdon, Grace, and Stout, Irving W. Teacher-parent interviews. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

38. Lawson, E. D.; George H., Jr., and Chmura, Kathy Jelonek. Computer programs for the semantic differential. Educational and Psychological Measurement 32 (Autumn, 1972): 779-84.

39. Lichtman, Paul. Home visitation--an answer. Education 87 (May, 1967): 562-4.

40. Lombard, Ellen C. Parents and the high school faculty. School Life 22 (Sept., 1936): 25.

41. Long, Barbara H.; Henderson, Edmund H., and Ziller, Robert C. Self-ratings on the semantic differential: Cont t versus response set. Child Development 39 (March-June, 1968): 649-56.

42. Macagnoni, Virginia Mary. Community and teacher perception of the school with implications for supervision. Dissertation Abstracts 20, No. 8: 3125, 1959.

43. Machnits, Earnest Jr. Negative viewpoint. Should teachers be encouraged to visit pupils' homes? The Instructor 75 (Oct., 1965): 15.

44. Manlove, Donald C. An appraisal of selected aspects of the Richmond Senior High School based upon opinions of parents, pupils, and teachers. Dissertation Abstracts 20, No. 8: 3126, 1959.

45. Mason City Directory, Mason City, Iowa, 1972.

46. Mason City High School. Registrar's Office. Unpublished enrollment list Fall semester. Mason City, Iowa: Mason City High School, 1972.

47. McCutcheon, David E. An investigation of the effect of a planned program of home visitation by teachers on student attitude, attendance and achievement of selected groups of students in school. Dissertation Abstracts 26A, No. 6: 3128, 1965.

48. McKee, Josephine. Neutral viewpoint. Should teachers be encouraged to visit pupils' homes? The Instructor 75 (Oct., 1965): 15.

49. Medinnus, Gene R. The development of a parent attitude toward education scale. The Journal of Educational Research 56, No. 2 (Oct., 1962): 100-3.

50. Meyer, Margaret R. Parent-teacher relationships in the early nineteenth century. The Journal of Educational Research 56, No. 1 (Sept., 1962): 48-50.

51. Nie, Norman; Bent, Dale H., and Hull, C. Hadlai. Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

52. Nie, Norman H., and Hull, O. Hadlai; with assistance of Jae-On Kim and Karin Steinbrenner. Statistical package for the social sciences: Update manual. National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1972.

53. Oetting, E. R. The effect of forcing response on the semantic differential. Educational and Psychological Measurement 27 (Autumn, 1967): 699-702.

54. Osgood, Charles E.; Suci, George J., and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

55. Popham, W. James. Educational statistics: Use and interpretation. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

56. Quisenberry, Dorothy Jean. A use of the semantic differential to determine the perceptions of students toward women high school physical education teachers. Dissertation Abstracts 31A, No. 7: 3324, 1970.

57. Ross, Maurice Albert. Analysis of the form 'A' visiting committee reports on California high schools 1966-67 and 1967-68 submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Dissertation Abstracts 30A, No. 4: 1379, 1969.

58. Rowland, Monroe King. Opinions of goals of secondary education held by parents and by educators. Dissertation Abstracts 21, No. 8: 2181, 1960.

59. Schoenhard, George Henry. Home visitation as a means of raising the academic attainment of high school students. Dissertation Abstracts 17, No. 5: 1042, 1957.

60. Schreiber, Nicholas. Home visits that count. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals 152 (Feb., 1948): 177-9.

61. Sharrock, Anne. Relations between home and school. The Journal of Educational Research 10 (June, 1968): 185-96.

62. Shaw, Marvin E., and Wright, Jarak M. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

63. Smith, Andrew J. Home visits are a 'must'. The Agricultural Education Magazine 28, No. 4 (Oct., 1955): 79-80.

64. Specht, David A. Scale reliability and analysis: Subprogram reliability. Unpublished mimeograph subprogram of the statistical package for the social sciences. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, Department of Sociology, 1973.

65. Svadkovskij, Ivan Fomic. Family and school. International Review of Education 16, No. 3 (1970): 341-50.

66. Swinsick, Robert Edmund. The home and school visitor: A description and analysis of services performed in selected public schools of Pennsylvania. Dissertation Abstracts 29A, No. 5: 1430, 1968.

67. Travis, Floyd John. A semantic differential study of teacher characteristics. Dissertation Abstracts 33A, No. 4: 1336, 1972.

68. Turabian, Kate L. A manual for writers of term papers, theses, and dissertations. 4th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

69. Value of home-school links rated by principals. School Life 16, No. 4 (Dec., 1930): 79.

70. Wert, James; Neidt, Charles O., and Ahman, J. Stanley. Statistical methods in education and psychological research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

71. Wilkerson, Curtis R. Is teacher home visitation valuable? Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals 43, No. 249 (Oct., 1959): 8-9.

72. Wittrock, M. C.; Wiley, David, and McNeil, John. The connotative meaning of the concept public school 'teachers': An image analysis of the semantic differential data. Educational and Psychological Measurement 27 (Winter, 1967): 863-9.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At the completion of a major study the investigator must realize that many individuals provided assistance which assured the successful completion of the investigation. The author is not unmindful of the situation and expresses his sincere gratitude and appreciation to those individuals who aided in any way during the investigation.

The author extends his sincere appreciation to the administration, faculty, parents and students of Mason City High School for their cooperation and participation in this study. Without their commitment the investigation would not have been possible.

Appreciation is extended to Drs. Ray Bryan, Milton Brown, Anton Netusil, Roy Hickman and John Mutchmor for serving on my committee and offering their support and assistance.

Sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Milton Brown for actively encouraging my entrance into the graduate program, serving as a confidant, acting as my academic adviser and offering personal encouragement throughout my graduate career.

Special thanks are expressed to Dr. Anton Netusil for providing his guidance concerning statistical techniques and for offering his willing assistance in several areas throughout the investigation. His confidence and encouragement provided support when it was needed most.

The author thanks his special friends Mr. John Wagner and Dr. Barbara Brittingham for their assistance with the research design, computer programs, statistical analysis and manuscript suggestions. Their efforts were most sincere and greatly appreciated.

The author wishes to thank and express his sincere gratitude to his parents Mr. and Mrs. Milton Barron for their faith, encouragement, support and understanding during this study and during the entire graduate program. Their support and encouragement were frequent and each unique occurrence shall be remembered in its own way.

APPENDIX

Correspondence

College of Education
Professional Studies
201 Curtiss Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Telephone: 515-294-4143

August 21, 1972

Parents & Guardians of Students
Mason City High School
Mason City, Iowa 50401

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Today more than ever, educators are aware of the need to involve parents and community members in the local school program. Mason City High School is a good example of a faculty and staff seeking to increase the amount of contact between home, school and community. Your cooperation is being sought in evaluating and determining the effects of such increased home-school contact.

A questionnaire has been enclosed asking your opinion about various aspects of Mason City schools. Please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. A pretest has indicated that about 30 minutes should be enough time to answer all of the questions. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions--we are interested in your opinion. Information from returned questionnaires will be handled in strictest confidence. The numbers on the questionnaire are for coding and follow up purposes only. Data will be treated at Iowa State University and the final report will consist of group averages; names and opinions of individuals will not be included.

This project has been fully approved by the administration of Mason City High School. The study will provide valuable information for the school in reaching its educational goals.

A stamped addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience in returning the enclosed questionnaire. Please try to have it completed and in the mail by August 26th.

A copy of the final report will be available upon request from Mason City High School. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. J. Netusil, Jr.
Associate Professor of Education
Iowa State University

John M. Barron
Graduate Researcher
Iowa State University

College of Education
Professional Studies
201 Curtiss Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Telephone: 515-294-4143

October 19, 1972

Parents & Guardians of Students
Mason City High School
Mason City, Iowa 50401

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Today more than ever, educators are aware of the need to involve parents and community members in the local school program. Mason City High School is a good example of a faculty and staff seeking to increase the amount of contact between home, school and community. Your cooperation is being sought in evaluating and determining the effects of such increased home-school contact.

A questionnaire has been enclosed asking your opinion about various aspects of Mason City schools. Please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. A pretest has indicated that about 30 minutes should be enough time to answer all of the questions. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions--we are interested in your opinion. Information from returned questionnaires will be handled in strictest confidence. The numbers on the questionnaire are for coding and follow up purposes only. Data will be treated at Iowa State University and the final report will consist of group averages; names and opinions of individuals will not be included.

This project has been fully approved by the administration of Mason City High School. The study will provide valuable information for the school in reaching its educational goals.

A stamped addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience in returning the enclosed questionnaire. Please try to have it completed and in the mail by October 31st.

A copy of the final report will be available upon request from Mason City High School. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. J. Netusil, Jr.
Associate Professor of Education
Iowa State University

John M. Barron
Graduate Researcher
Iowa State University

College of Education
Professional Studies
201 Curtiss Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Telephone: 515-294-4143

October 19, 1972

Parents & Guardians of Students
Mason City High School
Mason City, Iowa 50401

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Today more than ever, educators are aware of the need to involve parents and community members in the local school program. Mason City High School is a good example of a faculty and staff seeking to increase the amount of contact between home, school and community. As a parent or guardian of a 1972 Mason City High School graduate, your cooperation is being sought in evaluating and determining the effects of such increased home-school contact.

A questionnaire has been enclosed asking your opinion about various aspects of Mason City schools. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. A pretest has indicated that about thirty minutes should be enough time to answer all of the questions. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions--we are interested in your opinion. Information from returned questionnaires will be handled in strictest confidence. The numbers on the questionnaire are for coding and follow-up purposes only. Data will be treated at Iowa State University and the final report will consist of group averages. Names and opinions of individuals will not be included.

This project has been fully approved by the administration of Mason City High School. The study will provide valuable information for the school in reaching its educational goals.

A stamped addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience in returning the enclosed questionnaire. Please try to have it completed and in the mail by October 31st.

A copy of the final report will be available upon request from Mason City High School. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. J. Netusil, Jr.
Associate Professor of Education
Iowa State University

John M. Barron
Graduate Researcher
Iowa State University

College of Education
Professional Studies
201 Curtiss Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Telephone: 515-294-4143

November 2, 1972

Parents & Guardians of Students
Mason City High School
Mason City, Iowa 50401

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Today more than ever, educators are aware of the need to involve parents and community members in the local school program. Mason City High School is a good example of a faculty and staff seeking to increase the amount of contact between home, school and community. As a parent or guardian of a future Mason City High School sophomore, your cooperation is being sought in evaluating and determining the effects of such increased home-school contact.

A questionnaire has been enclosed asking your opinion about various aspects of Mason City schools. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. A pretest has indicated that about thirty minutes should be enough time to answer all of the questions. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions--we are interested in your opinion. Information from returned questionnaires will be handled in strictest confidence. The numbers on the questionnaire are for coding and follow-up purposes only. Data will be treated at Iowa State University and the final report will consist of group averages. Names and opinions of individuals will not be included.

This project has been fully approved by the administration of Mason City High School. The study will provide valuable information for the school in reaching its educational goals.

A stamped addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience in returning the enclosed questionnaire. Please try to have it completed and in the mail by November 10th.

A copy of the final report will be available upon request from Mason City High School. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. J. Vetusil, Jr.
Associate Professor of Education
Iowa State University

John M. Barron
Graduate Researcher
Iowa State University

College of Education
Professional Studies
201 Curtiss Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Telephone: 515-294-4143

November 13, 1972

Students of Mason City High School
Mason City High School
Mason City, Iowa 50401

Dear Student:

Today more than ever, educators are aware of the need to involve parents, students, and community members in the local school program. Mason City High School is a good example of a faculty and staff seeking to increase the amount of contact between home, school and community. As a student of Mason City High School, your cooperation is being sought in evaluating and determining the effects of such increased home-school contact.

The attached questionnaire asks your opinion about various aspects of Mason City High School. Please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. A pretest has indicated that about thirty minutes should be enough time to answer all of the questions--we are interested in your opinion. Information from returned questionnaires will be handled in strictest confidence. The numbers on the questionnaire are for coding and follow-up purposes only. Data will be treated at Iowa State University and the final report will consist of group averages. Names and opinions of individuals will not be included.

This project has been fully approved by the administration of Mason City High School. The study will provide valuable information for the school in reaching its educational goals.

A copy of the final report will be available upon request from Mason City High School after the completion of this study. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. J. Netusil, Jr.
A. J. Netusil, Jr.
Associate Professor of Education
Iowa State University

John M. Barron
John M. Barron
Graduate Researcher
Iowa State University

College of Education
Professional Studies
201 Curtiss Hall
Ames, Iowa 50010

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Telephone: 515-294-4143

November 24, 1972

Parents and Guardians of Students
Mason City High School
Mason City, Iowa 50401

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Recently you were selected to participate in a research study concerning several educational issues as they apply to Mason City High School. The purpose of this study is to provide some insight into various educational topics such as teacher home visits as perceived by parents of Mason City High School students. Parents of present, past and future Mason City High School students are being asked to respond to several educational issues by completing a questionnaire.

We are making excellent progress in our efforts but as of this date we have not received your completed questionnaire. The returns so far indicate that we are obtaining very valuable information concerning the educational programs of Mason City High School; which I am sure will be of interest to you.

Please help in this important study by returning your completed questionnaire now. I have enclosed another copy in case you have misplaced the original. All information will be held in strictest confidence and will not be associated with you as an individual.

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by December 4th. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. J. Netusil, Jr.

A. J. Netusil
Associate Professor of Education
Iowa State University

John M. Barron

John M. Barron
Graduate Researcher
Iowa State University

Questionnaire

PROJECT OUTREACH - MCHS QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I. QUESTIONS ABOUT EDUCATION

Directions:

These questions are designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about education in general. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly. Do not take too long on any one question.

READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY AND INDICATE THE PHRASE WHICH BEST EXPRESSES YOUR FEELING ABOUT THE STATEMENT. Wherever possible, let your own personal experience determine your answer. If in doubt, indicate the phrase which seems most nearly to express your feeling about the statement. WORK RAPIDLY. Be sure to answer every item.

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES

Read each statement carefully. Indicate whether you STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, UNDECIDED, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE with each statement. Mark your answers in the following manner:

If you STRONGLY AGREE with the statement, circle "SA". (SA) A U D SD

If you AGREE with the statement, circle "A".....SA (A) U D SD

If you are somewhat UNDECIDED about the statement, circle "U" .....SA A (U) D SD

If you DISAGREE with the statement, circle "D".....SA A U (D) SD

If you STRONGLY DISAGREE with the statement, circle "SD".....SA A U D (SD)

1. A person can learn more by working four years than by going to high school. SA A U D SD

2. The more education a person has the better he is able to enjoy life. SA A U D SD

3. Education helps a person to use his leisure time to better advantage. SA A U D SD

4. A good education is a great comfort to a person out of work. SA A U D SD

5.	Only subjects like reading, composition and math should be taught at public expense.	SA A U D SD
6.	Education is no help in getting a job today.	SA A U D SD
7.	Most young people are getting too much education.	SA A U D SD
8.	A high school education is worth all the time and effort it requires.	SA A U D SD
9.	Our schools encourage an individual to think for himself.	SA A U D SD
10.	There are too many fads and frills in modern education.	SA A U D SD
11.	Education only makes a person discontented.	SA A U D SD
12.	Schooling is of little help in meeting the problems of real life.	SA A U D SD
13.	Education tends to make an individual less conceited.	SA A U D SD
14.	Solution of the world's problems will come through education.	SA A U D SD
15.	High school courses are too impractical.	SA A U D SD
16.	A person is foolish to keep going to school if he or she can get a job.	SA A U D SD
17.	Savings spent on education are wisely invested.	SA A U D SD
18.	An educated person can advance more rapidly in business and industry.	SA A U D SD
19.	Parents should not be compelled to send their children to school.	SA A U D SD
20.	Education is more valuable than most people think.	SA A U D SD
21.	A high school education makes a person a better citizen.	SA A U D SD
22.	Public money spent on education during the past few years could have been used more wisely for other purposes.	SA A U D SD

PART II. QUESTIONS ABOUT MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL

These questions are designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about Mason City High School. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly. Do not take too long on any one question.

Fill in the information below. You will notice that there is no place for your name. Please do not record your name. All responses will be strictly confidential and results will be reported by groups only. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

School_____ Date_____
month day year

Age_____ Sex_____ Highest degree completed_____

_____ Years of teaching experience

_____ Years in Mason City District

_____ Years in Mason City High School

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES

Read each statement carefully. Indicate whether you AGREE, PROBABLY AGREE, PROBABLY DISAGREE, OR DISAGREE with each statement. Mark your answers in the following manner:

If you AGREE with the statement, circle "A"..... (A) PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but PROBABLY AGREE with the statement, circle "PA"..... A (PA) PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but PROBABLY DISAGREE with the statement, circle "PD"..... A PA (PD) D

If you DISAGREE with the statement, circle "D"..... A PA PD (D)

1. Mason City High School has a well-balanced curriculum. A PA PD D
2. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences. A PA PD D
3. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions. A PA PD D

PART II. QUESTIONS ABOUT MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL

These questions are designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about Mason City High School. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly. Do not take too long on any one question.

Fill in the information below. You will notice that there is no place for your name. Please do not record your name. All responses will be strictly confidential and results will be reported by groups only. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

Please indicate the relationship to the high school student of the person(s) who:

Filled out this questionnaire	Was at parent-teacher conference
_____ Mother	_____ Mother
_____ Father	_____ Father
_____ Guardian(s)	_____ Guardian(s)

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES

Read each statement carefully. Indicate whether you AGREE, PROBABLY AGREE, PROBABLY DISAGREE, OR DISAGREE with each statement. Mark your answers in the following manner:

If you AGREE with the statement, circle "A"..... (A) PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but PROBABLY AGREE with the statement, circle "PA"..... A (PA) PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but PROBABLY DISAGREE with the statement, circle "PD"..... A PA (PD) D

If you DISAGREE with the statement, circle "D"..... A PA PD (D)

1. Mason City High School has a well-balanced curriculum. A PA PD D
2. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences. A PA PD D
3. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions. A PA PD D

PART II. QUESTIONS ABOUT MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL

These questions are designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about Mason City High School. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly. Do not take too long on any one question.

Fill in the information below. You will notice that there is no place for your name. Please do not record your name. All responses will be strictly confidential and results will be reported by groups only. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

Please indicate who:

Filled out this questionnaire

_____ Sophomore

_____ Junior

_____ Senior

Indicate your sex

_____ Male

_____ Female

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES

Read each statement carefully. Indicate whether you AGREE, PROBABLY AGREE, PROBABLY DISAGREE, OR DISAGREE with each statement. Mark your answers in the following manner:

If you AGREE with the statement, circle "A"..... (A) PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but PROBABLY AGREE with the statement, circle "PA" ..... A (PA) PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but PROBABLY DISAGREE with the statement, circle "PD" ..... A PA (PD) D

If you DISAGREE with the statement, circle "D" ..... A PA PD (D)

1. Mason City High School has a well-balanced curriculum. A PA PD D

2. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences. A PA PD D

3. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions. A PA PD D

4.	The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.	A PA PD D
5.	Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.	A PA PD D
6.	Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.	A PA PD D
7.	In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family.	A PA PD D
8.	The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system.	A PA PD D
9.	The community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.	A PA PD D
10.	This community is willing to support a good program of education.	A PA PD D
11.	This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.	A PA PD D
12.	Nonprofessional activities of a teacher in this community, outside of school, are unduly restricted.	A PA PD D
13.	Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.	A PA PD D
14.	Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities.	A PA PD D
15.	Community pressures prevent teachers from doing their best as a teacher.	A PA PD D
16.	Teachers at Mason City High School are well prepared for their specific curricular areas.	A PA PD D

PART III. QUESTIONS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL CONCEPTS

The purpose of these questions is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. Please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On the following pages you will find different concepts to be judged, and beneath each concept a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Please use the scales in the following manner.

If you feel that a concept is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair __X__ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : unfair

or

fair _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : __X__ : unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely) you should place your check-mark as follows:

strong _____ : __X__ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : weak

or

strong _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : __X__ : _____ : weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active _____ : _____ : __X__ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : passive

or

active _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : __X__ : _____ : _____ : passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you are judging. If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space.

safe _____ : _____ : _____ : __X__ : _____ : _____ : _____ : dangerous

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

	This			Not this			
				X			
_____:	_X_:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept -- DO NOT OMIT ANY.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high speed. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impression, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.

MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL

Good	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Bad
Small	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Large
Valuable	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Worthless
Dishonest	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Honest
Rugged	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Delicate
Tense	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Relaxed
Deep	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Shallow
Unfair	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Fair
Wide	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Narrow
Weak	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Strong
Severe	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Lenient
Pleasant	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____: Unpleasant

STUDENTS AT MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad

Small _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Large

Valuable _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Worthless

Dishonest _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Honest

Rugged _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Delicate

Tense _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Relaxed

Deep _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Shallow

Unfair _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Fair

Wide _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Narrow

Weak _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Strong

Severe _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Lenient

Pleasant _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unpleasant

8

EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad

Small _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Large

Valuable _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Worthless

Dishonest _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Honest

Rugged _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Delicate

Tense _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Relaxed

Deep _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Shallow

Unfair _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Fair

Wide _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Narrow

Weak _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Strong

Severe _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Lenient

Pleasant _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unpleasant

9

PARENTS OF MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad

Small _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Large

Valuable _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Worthless

Dishonest _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Honest

Rugged _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Delicate

Tense _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Relaxed

Deep _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Shallow

Unfair _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Fair

Wide _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Narrow

Weak _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Strong

Severe _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Lenient

Pleasant _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unpleasant

10

TEACHER HOME VISITS

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad

Small _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Large

Valuable _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Worthless

Dishonest _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Honest

Rugged _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Delicate

Tense _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Relaxed

Deep _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Shallow

Unfair _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Fair

Wide _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Narrow

Weak _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Strong

Severe _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Lenient

Pleasant _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unpleasant

11

TEACHERS AT MASON CITY HIGH SCHOOL

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad

Small _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Large

Valuable _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Worthless

Dishonest _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Honest

Rugged _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Delicate

Tense _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Relaxed

Deep _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Shallow

Unfair _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Fair

Wide _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Narrow

Weak _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Strong

Severe _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Lenient

Pleasant _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unpleasant

Tables

Table 23. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the total education scale

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 72.03 S = 4.37 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 72.77 S = 6.04 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 72.36 S = 5.15 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 75.21 S = 4.82 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 73.80 S = 5.16 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 74.62 S = 4.90 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 72.97 S = 4.69 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 73.05 S = 5.76 N = 37	

Table 24. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for curriculum issues

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 10.75 S = 1.25 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 10.85 S = 0.98 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 10.80 S = 1.13 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 10.57 S = 1.50 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 11.10 S = 1.44 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 10.79 S = 1.47 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.31 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.44 N = 37	

Table 25. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for community support of education

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 7.12 S = 2.42 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 7.48 S = 2.35 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 7.28 S = 2.37 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 7.35 S = 1.86 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 6.80 S = 1.75 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 7.12 S = 1.80 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 7.19 S = 2.25 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 7.29 S = 2.20 N = 37	

Table 26. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for community pressures

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 15.81 S = 1.77 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 15.88 S = 1.94 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 15.85 S = 1.83 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 16.00 S = 1.71 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.70 S = 1.25 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 16.29 S = 1.54 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 1.73 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 16.10 S = 1.80 N = 37	

Table 27. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 13.15 S = 5.86 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 12.85 S = 3.71 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 13.01 S = 4.97 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 12.35 S = 4.19 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 12.80 S = 4.96 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 12.54 S = 4.43 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 12.91 S = 5.39 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 12.83 S = 4.01 N = 37	

Table 28. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 18.21 S = 3.36 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 18.59 S = 3.54 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 18.38 S = 3.42 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 17.14 S = 3.50 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 18.20 S = 2.78 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 17.58 S = 3.20 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 17.89 S = 3.40 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.48 S = 3.32 N = 37	

Table 29. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 14.36 S = 4.19 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 14.25 S = 3.77 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 3.98 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 14.21 S = 3.88 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.50 S = 3.68 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 14.33 S = 3.72 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 4.06 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 14.32 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 30. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 20.51 S = 2.71 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 21.25 S = 3.23 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 20.85 S = 2.95 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 20.21 S = 3.62 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.00 S = 3.77 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.54 S = 3.62 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.42 S = 2.97 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.18 S = 3.33 N = 37	

Table 31. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 18.33 S = 5.10 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 19.18 S = 5.30 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 18.71 S = 5.17 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 17.21 S = 5.43 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.80 S = 3.88 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 17.04 S = 4.75 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 5.17 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.54 S = 5.02 N = 37	

Table 32. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 21.15 S = 5.05 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 21.07 S = 3.68 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 21.11 S = 4.45 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 19.57 S = 4.05 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 19.80 S = 4.54 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 19.66 S = 4.16 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.68 S = 4.78 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.91 N = 37	

Table 33. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 15.69 S = 4.44 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 16.33 S = 3.82 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 15.98 S = 4.15 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 15.00 S = 3.96 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.80 S = 3.32 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 14.91 S = 3.63 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.48 S = 4.27 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 3.71 N = 37	

Table 34. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 21.21 S = 3.24 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 22.07 S = 3.83 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 21.60 S = 3.51 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 20.78 S = 3.98 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.50 S = 3.13 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.66 S = 3.58 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 3.44 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.68 N = 37	

Table 35. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 14.51 S = 5.76 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 13.88 S = 3.53 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 14.23 S = 4.85 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 16.35 S = 4.74 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 12.60 S = 5.81 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 14.79 S = 5.43 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.06 S = 5.49 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.54 S = 4.22 N = 37	

Table 36. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 21.45 S = 4.09 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 21.11 S = 3.29 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 21.30 S = 3.72 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 22.50 S = 3.95 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 19.90 S = 3.66 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 14.79 S = 5.43 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.76 S = 4.03 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.78 S = 3.39 N = 37	

Table 37. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 13.57 S = 4.43 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 14.03 S = 3.24 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 13.78 S = 3.91 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 12.42 S = 1.98 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 12.90 S = 5.04 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 12.62 S = 3.49 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 13.23 S = 3.87 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.72 S = 3.76 N = 37	

Table 38. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and sex category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Previsit group	Post visit group	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 20.12 S = 3.92 N = 33	$\bar{X}$ = 21.07 S = 3.81 N = 27	$\bar{X}$ = 20.55 S = 3.87 N = 60
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 18.35 S = 4.34 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 19.80 S = 3.42 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 18.95 S = 3.97 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.59 S = 4.08 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 39. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the total education scale

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 75.06 S = 4.55 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 76.20 S = 3.55 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 75.52 S = 4.14 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 72.47 S = 4.87 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 74.50 S = 5.36 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 73.28 S = 5.09 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 71.09 S = 3.70 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 69.07 S = 5.59 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 70.00 S = 4.82 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 72.97 S = 4.69 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 73.05 S = 5.76 N = 37	

Table 40. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for curriculum issues

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 10.26 S = 1.26 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 11.20 S = 1.03 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 10.64 S = 1.25 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 11.00 S = 1.34 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 10.64 S = 0.63 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 10.85 S = 1.11 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 10.72 S = 1.27 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 11.00 S = 1.52 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 10.87 S = 1.39 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.31 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.11 N = 37	

Table 41. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for community support of education

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 8.46 S = 2.56 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 8.00 S = 2.62 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 8.28 S = 2.54 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 6.90 S = 1.86 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 7.71 S = 2.09 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 7.22 S = 1.97 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 6.00 S = 1.73 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 6.30 S = 1.75 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 6.16 S = 1.71 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 7.19 S = 2.25 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 7.29 S = 2.20 N = 37	

Table 42. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for community pressures

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 15.26 S = 1.48 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 15.90 S = 2.18 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 15.52 S = 1.78 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 16.00 S = 1.78 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 16.28 S = 1.49 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.11 S = 1.65 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 16.45 S = 1.86 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 16.07 S = 1.93 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 16.25 S = 1.87 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 1.73 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 16.10 S = 1.80 N = 37	

Table 43. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 12.80 S = 5.53 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 12.60 S = 3.53 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 12.72 S = 4.74 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 12.61 S = 3.47 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 12.07 S = 2.92 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 12.40 S = 3.22 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 13.63 S = 8.12 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 13.84 S = 5.28 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 13.75 S = 6.58 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 12.91 S = 5.39 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 12.83 S = 4.01 N = 37	

Table 44. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 17.53 S = 2.90 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 17.10 S = 2.99 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 17.36 S = 2.88 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 18.47 S = 2.96 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 19.00 S = 3.46 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 18.68 S = 3.13 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 17.27 S = 4.75 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 19.00 S = 3.34 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 18.20 S = 4.05 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 17.89 S 3.40 N 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.48 S = 3.32 N = 37	

Table 45. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 13.73 S = 3.75 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 12.80 S = 3.82 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 13.36 S = 3.72 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 13.95 S = 4.17 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 14.35 S = 3.02 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.11 S = 3.71 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 15.81 S = 4.26 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 15.46 S = 4.11 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 15.62 S = 4.09 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 4.06 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 14.32 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 46. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 20.46 S = 3.42 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.30 S = 4.44 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.40 S = 3.77 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 20.42 S = 3.14 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 2.67 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.91 S = 2.98 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 20.36 S = 2.15 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 21.38 S = 3.12 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 20.91 S = 2.71 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.42 S = 2.97 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.18 S = 3.33 N = 37	

Table 47. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 19.66 S = 6.06 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 18.70 S = 5.03 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 19.28 S = 5.58 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 16.66 S = 5.07 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 19.78 S = 5.30 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 17.91 S = 5.32 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 18.27 S = 3.49 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 17.07 S = 4.69 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 17.62 S = 4.14 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 5.17 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.54 S = 5.02 N = 37	

Table 48. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 20.60 S = 3.75 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.70 S = 4.13 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.64 S = 3.82 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 21.04 S = 5.51 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 21.35 S = 2.43 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.17 S = 4.49 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 20.09 S = 4.90 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.07 S = 5.07 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 20.08 S = 4.88 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.68 S = 4.78 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.91 N = 37	

Table 49. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 15.40 S = 3.90 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 13.90 S = 2.88 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 16.00 S = 3.95 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 15.33 S = 4.81 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 17.21 S = 3.40 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.08 S = 4.34 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 15.90 S = 3.91 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 16.07 S = 4.15 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 14.80 S = 3.60 N = 25
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.48 S = 4.27 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 3.71 N = 37	

Table 50. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 20.53 S = 3.37 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.70 S = 3.02 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.60 S = 3.17 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 21.00 S = 3.86 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 23.50 S = 2.79 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 22.00 S = 3.64 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 22.00 S = 2.72 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.38 S = 4.35 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 21.12 S = 3.71 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 3.44 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.68 N = 37	

Table 51. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 16.60 S = 4.79 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 13.20 S = 5.80 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 15.24 S = 5.37 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 13.90 S = 5.68 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 13.28 S = 3.45 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 13.65 S = 4.86 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 15.18 S = 5.96 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 14.07 S = 3.84 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 14.58 S = 4.84 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.06 S = 5.49 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.54 S = 4.22 N = 37	

Table 52. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 22.26 S = 3.82 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.60 S = 4.35 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 21.60 S = 4.04 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 20.76 S = 4.56 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 20.85 S = 2.03 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.80 S = 3.71 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 23.00 S = 2.96 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.84 S = 3.97 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 21.83 S = 3.64 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.76 S = 4.03 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.78 S = 3.39 N = 37	

Table 53. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 13.26 S = 3.53 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 12.60 S = 4.57 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 13.00 S = 3.90 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 13.61 S = 4.04 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 14.21 S = 2.77 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 13.85 S = 3.55 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 12.45 S = 4.25 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 14.07 S = 4.13 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 13.33 S = 4.17 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 13.23 S = 3.87 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.72 S = 3.76 N = 37	

Table 54. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and age category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Age	Previsit group	Post visit group	Age descriptors
<30	$\bar{X}$ = 19.06 S = 4.18 N = 15	$\bar{X}$ = 21.30 S = 4.52 N = 10	$\bar{X}$ = 19.96 S = 4.37 N = 25
≥30 <40	$\bar{X}$ = 19.47 S = 4.03 N = 21	$\bar{X}$ = 20.50 S = 3.08 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 19.88 S = 3.66 N = 35
≥40	$\bar{X}$ = 20.54 S = 4.29 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.53 S = 3.90 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 20.54 S = 3.99 N = 24
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.59 S = 4.08 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 55. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the total education scale

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 74.87 S = 4.64 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 75.00 S = 4.28 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 74.92 S = 4.41 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 72.00 S = 4.48 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 72.12 S = 6.21 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 72.05 S = 5.27 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 72.97 S = 4.69 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 73.05 S = 5.76 N = 37	

Table 56. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for curriculum issues

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 10.25 S = 1.65 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 11.08 S = 0.99 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 10.60 S = 1.44 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 10.93 S = 1.06 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 10.84 S = 1.17 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 10.89 S = 1.10 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.31 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.11 N = 37	

Table 57. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for community support of education

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 7.68 S = 2.57 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 7.66 S = 2.53 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 7.67 S = 2.51 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 6.93 S = 2.06 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 7.12 S = 2.06 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 7.01 S = 2.04 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 7.19 S = 2.25 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 7.29 S = 2.20 N = 37	

Table 58. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for community pressures

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 15.75 S = 1.57 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 16.16 S = 2.08 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 15.92 S = 1.78 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 15.93 S = 1.84 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 16.08 S = 1.70 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 16.00 S = 1.76 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 1.73 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 16.10 S = 1.80 N = 37	

Table 59. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 12.06 S = 3.80 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 11.58 S = 3.98 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 11.85 S = 3.81 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 13.35 S = 6.06 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 13.44 S = 3.96 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 13.39 S = 5.18 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 12.91 S = 5.39 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 12.83 S = 4.01 N = 37	

Table 60. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 17.43 S = 3.24 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 17.25 S = 2.76 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 17.35 S = 2.99 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 18.12 S = 3.50 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 19.08 S = 3.45 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 18.55 S = 3.48 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 17.89 S = 3.40 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.48 S = 3.32 N = 37	

Table 61. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 3.70 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 12.75 S = 3.46 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 13.64 S = 3.62 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 14.32 S = 4.30 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 15.08 S = 3.63 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 14.66 S = 4.00 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 4.06 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 14.32 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 62. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 20.81 S = 3.60 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 20.83 S = 4.21 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.82 S = 3.80 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 20.22 S = 2.64 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 21.36 S = 2.89 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 20.73 S = 2.79 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.42 S = 2.97 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.18 S = 3.33 N = 37	

Table 63. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 18.31 S = 6.41 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 17.75 S = 5.06 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 18.07 S = 5.77 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 17.83 S = 4.51 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 18.92 S = 5.06 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 18.32 S = 4.75 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 5.17 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.54 S = 5.02 N = 37	

Table 64. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 19.31 S = 3.38 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 20.00 S = 4.34 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 19.60 S = 3.76 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 21.38 S = 5.28 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 3.73 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 21.25 S = 4.61 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.68 S = 4.78 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.91 N = 37	

Table 65. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 15.31 S = 3.38 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 13.75 S = 2.92 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 14.64 S = 3.23 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 15.58 S = 4.72 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 16.96 S = 3.64 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 16.19 S = 4.29 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.48 S = 4.27 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 3.71 N = 37	

Table 66. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 20.75 S = 3.58 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 20.66 S = 2.93 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.71 S = 3.26 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 21.25 S = 3.41 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 22.12 S = 3.96 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.66 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 3.44 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.68 N = 37	

Table 67. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 16.06 S = 4.85 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 12.25 S = 5.73 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 14.42 S = 5.49 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 14.54 S = 5.80 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 14.16 S = 3.22 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 14.37 S = 4.78 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.06 S = 5.49 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.54 S = 4.22 N = 37	

Table 68. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 21.75 S = 5.11 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 20.25 S = 4.07 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 21.10 S = 4.67 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 21.77 S = 3.45 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 21.04 S = 3.07 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 21.44 S = 3.28 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.76 S = 4.03 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.78 S = 3.39 N = 37	

Table 69. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 12.75 S = 2.23 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 11.83 S = 4.50 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 12.35 S = 3.35 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 13.48 S = 4.51 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 14.64 S = 3.05 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 14.00 S = 3.94 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 13.23 S = 3.87 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.72 S = 3.76 N = 37	

Table 70. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and degree category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Degree	Previsit group	Post visit group	Degree descriptors
Bachelor's degree	$\bar{X}$ = 19.12 S = 4.58 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 20.66 S = 4.59 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 19.78 S = 4.57 N = 28
Master's degree or above	$\bar{X}$ = 19.83 S = 3.86 N = 31	$\bar{X}$ = 20.76 S = 3.30 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 20.25 S = 3.62 N = 56
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.59 S = 4.08 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 71. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the total education scale

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 73.66 S = 4.61 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 75.35 S = 5.61 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 74.28 S = 4.99 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 72.62 S = 5.39 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 74.72 S = 3.97 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 73.48 S = 4.89 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 71.42 S = 3.10 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 68.83 S = 5.30 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 69.78 S = 4.69 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 72.97 S = 4.69 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 73.05 S = 5.76 N = 37	

Table 72. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for curriculum issues

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.33 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 10.92 S = 0.91 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 10.78 S = 1.18 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 10.56 S = 1.26 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 10.90 S = 0.70 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.06 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 11.00 S = 1.52 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.62 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 10.94 S = 1.54 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 77.19 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.11 N = 37	

Table 73. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for community support of education

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 8.08 S = 2.32 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 8.00 S = 2.48 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 8.05 S = 2.34 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 6.12 S = 1.74 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 7.54 S = 2.25 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 6.70 S = 2.05 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 6.57 S = 1.98 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 6.25 S = 1.48 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 6.36 S = 1.64 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 7.19 S = 2.25 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 7.29 S = 2.20 N = 37	

Table 74. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for community pressures

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 15.25 S = 1.80 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 15.85 S = 1.99 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 15.47 S = 1.87 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 16.68 S = 0.94 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 16.63 S = 1.43 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 16.66 S = 1.14 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 16.14 S = 2.26 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 1.92 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 16.00 S = 2.00 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 1.73 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 16.10 S = 1.80 N = 37	

Table 75. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 12.87 S = 4.55 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 12.85 S = 3.46 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 12.86 S = 4.13 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 12.00 S = 3.77 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 12.09 S = 3.80 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 12.03 S = 3.71 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 15.14 S = 9.99 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 13.50 S = 4.94 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 14.10 S = 6.99 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 12.91 S = 5.39 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 12.83 S = 4.01 N = 37	

Table 76. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 17.62 S = 2.88 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 19.28 S = 3.95 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 18.23 S = 3.36 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 18.50 S = 2.89 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 17.45 S = 2.62 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 18.07 S = 2.78 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 17.42 S = 5.85 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 18.50 S = 3.09 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 18.10 S = 4.18 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 17.89 S = 3.40 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.48 S = 3.32 N = 37	

Table 77. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 14.25 S = 3.42 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 14.57 S = 3.65 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.36 S = 3.46 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 13.62 S = 4.58 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 13.72 S = 4.14 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 13.66 S = 4.33 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 16.14 S = 4.87 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 14.58 S = 3.60 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 15.15 S = 4.05 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 4.06 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 14.32 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 78. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 20.20 S = 3.29 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 21.35 S = 3.89 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.63 S = 3.52 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 21.06 S = 2.74 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 20.81 S = 2.89 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.96 S = 2.75 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 19.71 S = 2.36 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 21.33 S = 3.25 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.73 S = 2.99 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.42 S = 2.97 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.18 S = 3.33 N = 37	

Table 79. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 18.33 S = 5.54 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 21.14 S = 4.63 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 19.36 S = 5.34 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 17.68 S = 4.79 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 5.45 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 17.81 S = 4.97 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 17.57 S = 5.38 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 16.00 S = 3.76 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 16.57 S = 4.35 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 5.17 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.54 S = 5.02 N = 37	

Table 80. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 20.62 S = 4.43 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 21.14 S = 3.67 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.81 S = 4.12 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.81 S = 5.33 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 22.00 S = 3.68 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 21.29 S = 4.68 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.57 S = 5.41 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 19.08 S = 4.12 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 19.63 S = 4.54 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.68 S = 4.78 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.91 N = 37	

Table 81. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4	$\bar{X}$ = 15.75 S = 3.71 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 17.00 S = 4.03 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.21 S = 3.82 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 5.27 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 15.63 S = 3.88 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 15.77 S = 4.67 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 13.71 S = 3.68 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 14.91 S = 3.08 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 14.47 S = 3.27 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.48 S = 4.27 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 3.71 N = 37	

Table 82. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4	$\bar{X}$ = 20.91 S = 3.06 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 22.71 S = 3.70 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.57 S = 3.38 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 21.18 S = 4.05 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 22.18 S = 2.56 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 21.59 S = 3.50 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 21.42 S = 3.69 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 19.91 S = 4.14 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.47 S = 3.94 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 3.44 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.68 N = 37	

Table 83. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 4.79 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 14.78 S = 4.28 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 15.50 S = 4.58 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 13.62 S = 5.66 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 11.90 S = 4.48 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 12.92 S = 5.19 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 15.42 S = 7.36 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 13.58 S = 3.70 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 14.26 S = 5.22 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.06 S = 5.49 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.54 S = 4.22 N = 37	

Table 84. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 22.33 S = 3.63 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 20.71 S = 3.89 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.73 S = 3.76 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.50 S = 4.81 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 21.36 S = 2.11 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.85 S = 3.90 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 22.71 S = 3.14 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 20.33 S = 3.89 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 21.21 S = 3.73 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.76 S = 4.03 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.78 S = 3.39 N = 37	

Table 85. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4 years	$\bar{X}$ = 13.58 S = 2.96 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 14.00 S = 3.76 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 13.73 S = 3.23 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 12.68 S = 4.74 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 13.09 S = 3.67 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 12.85 S = 12.26 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 13.28 S = 4.92 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 14.00 S = 4.11 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 13.73 S = 4.30 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 13.23 S = 3.87 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.72 S = 3.76 N = 37	

Table 86. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and MCHS experience category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	MCHS experience descriptors
<4	$\bar{X}$ = 18.75 S = 3.84 N = 24	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.81 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 19.81 S = 4.03 N = 38
≥4 <10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.31 S = 4.01 N = 16	$\bar{X}$ = 21.00 S = 4.31 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.59 S = 4.06 N = 27
≥10	$\bar{X}$ = 20.85 S = 5.01 N = 7	$\bar{X}$ = 19.41 S = 2.81 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 19.94 S = 3.70 N = 19
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.59 S = 4.08 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 87. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the total education scale

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 75.76 S = 4.88 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 75.27 S = 5.64 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 75.54 S = 5.13 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 72.50 S = 4.76 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 74.35 S = 5.79 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 73.26 S = 5.21 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 71.07 S = 3.26 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 69.50 S = 4.38 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 70.34 S = 3.82 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 72.97 S = 4.69 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 73.05 S = 5.76 N = 37	

Table 88. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for curriculum issues

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 10.23 S = 1.23 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 11.27 S = 0.78 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.16 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 10.90 S = 1.41 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 10.64 S = 0.74 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 10.79 S = 1.17 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 10.85 S = 1.23 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.62 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 10.88 S = 1.39 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 10.70 S = 1.31 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 10.91 S = 1.11 N = 37	

Table 89. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for community support of education

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 8.30 S = 2.46 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 7.90 S = 2.62 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 8.12 S = 2.49 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 7.10 S = 2.24 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 7.50 S = 2.21 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 7.26 S = 2.20 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 6.28 S = 1.68 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 6.50 S = 1.67 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 6.38 S = 1.65 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 7.19 S = 2.25 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 7.29 S = 2.20 N = 37	

Table 90. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for community pressures

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 15.30 S = 1.37 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 16.18 S = 1.99 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 15.70 S = 1.70 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 15.70 S = 1.86 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 15.85 S = 1.87 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 15.76 S = 1.84 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 16.64 S = 1.69 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.33 S = 1.67 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 16.50 S = 1.65 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 1.73 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 16.10 S = 1.80 N = 37	

Table 91. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 11.76 S = 3.87 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 11.81 S = 3.31 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 11.79 S = 3.55 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 13.50 S = 4.85 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 13.35 S = 3.99 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 13.44 S = 4.45 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 13.14 S = 7.26 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 13.16 S = 4.74 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 13.15 S = 6.11 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 12.91 S = 5.39 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 12.83 S = 4.01 N = 37	

Table 92. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 17.61 S = 2.90 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 17.63 S = 3.07 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 17.62 S = 2.91 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 18.40 S = 3.18 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 18.78 S = 3.49 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 18.55 S = 3.26 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 17.42 S = 4.20 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 18.91 S = 3.47 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 18.11 S = 3.88 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 17.89 S = 3.40 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.48 S = 3.32 N = 37	

Table 93. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 13.38 S = 3.57 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 12.54 S = 3.50 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 13.00 S = 3.48 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 14.40 S = 4.44 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 15.14 S = 3.37 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.70 S = 3.99 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 15.07 S = 4.04 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 15.00 S = 3.97 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 15.03 S = 3.93 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 14.31 S = 4.06 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 14.32 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 94. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 20.38 S = 3.68 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 4.45 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.54 S = 3.96 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.70 S = 3.11 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 21.07 S = 2.12 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.85 S = 2.72 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.07 S = 2.09 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.75 S = 3.51 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.84 S = 2.90 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.42 S = 2.97 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.18 S = 3.33 N = 37	

Table 95. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 19.38 S = 6.33 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 19.00 S = 5.79 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 19.20 S = 5.96 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 17.10 S = 5.11 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 20.00 S = 5.09 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 18.29 S = 5.23 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 4.03 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.41 S = 3.67 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 17.26 S = 3.88 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 18.00 S = 5.17 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 18.54 S = 5.02 N = 37	

Table 96. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 20.00 S = 3.48 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 20.54 S = 4.05 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.25 S = 3.68 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 21.25 S = 5.49 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 21.28 S = 3.47 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.26 S = 4.70 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.50 S = 4.97 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.25 S = 4.49 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.38 S = 4.66 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.68 S = 4.78 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.91 N = 37	

Table 97. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 15.23 S = 3.49 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 14.27 S = 3.60 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 14.79 S = 3.50 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 15.65 S = 5.13 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 17.57 S = 3.15 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 16.44 S = 4.47 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 15.50 S = 3.85 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 15.50 S = 3.89 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 15.50 S = 3.79 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.48 S = 4.27 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 15.91 S = 3.71 N = 37	

Table 98. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 20.30 S = 3.54 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 21.36 S = 3.41 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 20.79 S = 3.45 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.95 S = 3.80 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 22.92 S = 2.92 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.76 S = 3.55 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 22.00 S = 2.77 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.41 S = 4.46 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 21.26 S = 3.66 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 3.44 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 3.68 N = 37	

Table 99. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 16.46 S = 4.92 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 13.09 S = 5.37 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 14.91 S = 5.30 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 13.75 S = 5.80 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 13.28 S = 3.38 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 13.55 S = 4.89 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 15.64 S = 5.48 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.25 S = 4.20 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 15.00 S = 4.89 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 15.06 S = 5.49 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.54 S = 4.22 N = 37	

Table 100. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
< 6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 22.23 S = 4.12 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 19.72 S = 3.77 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 21.08 S = 4.08 N = 24
> 6 < 15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.65 S = 4.59 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 21.64 S = 2.37 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 21.05 S = 3.82 N = 34
≥ 15	$\bar{X}$ = 22.92 S = 2.75 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.75 S = 4.00 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 21.92 S = 3.49 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.76 S = 4.03 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.78 S = 3.39 N = 37	

Table 101. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
<6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 12.38 S = 1.85 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 12.09 S = 3.56 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 12.25 S = 2.70 N = 24
>6 <15	$\bar{X}$ = 14.50 S = 4.62 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 14.78 S = 3.30 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.61 S = 4.08 N = 34
≥15	$\bar{X}$ = 12.21 S = 3.80 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 14.00 S = 4.22 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 13.03 S = 4.02 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 13.23 S = 3.87 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 13.72 S = 3.76 N = 37	

Table 102. Descriptive presentation of the data for teacher group and total teaching experience for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Experience	Previsit group	Post visit group	Total experience descriptors
< 6 years	$\bar{X}$ = 18.30 S = 3.77 N = 13	$\bar{X}$ = 20.27 S = 3.52 N = 11	$\bar{X}$ = 19.20 S = 3.71 N = 24
> 6 < 15	$\bar{X}$ = 20.20 S = 4.09 N = 20	$\bar{X}$ = 21.14 S = 4.41 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.58 S = 4.19 N = 34
≥ 15	$\bar{X}$ = 19.92 S = 4.37 N = 14	$\bar{X}$ = 20.66 S = 3.20 N = 12	$\bar{X}$ = 20.26 S = 3.82 N = 26
Visit descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.59 S = 4.08 N = 47	$\bar{X}$ = 20.72 S = 3.70 N = 37	

Table 103. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the total education scale

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 67.20 S = 6.27 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 67.96 S = 4.76 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 70.20 S = 5.30 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 68.35 S = 5.56 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 71.28 S = 4.94 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 70.76 S = 7.26 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 71.03 S = 4.17 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 71.03 S = 5.53 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 69.17 S = 5.98 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 69.26 S = 6.16 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 70.62 S = 4.73 N = 51	

Table 104. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for curriculum issues

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 11.83 S = 1.51 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 10.86 S = 1.63 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 11.12 S = 1.85 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 11.28 S = 1.69 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 11.28 S = 1.51 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 12.07 S = 1.67 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 11.50 S = 1.52 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 11.61 S = 1.58 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 11.56 S = 1.52 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 11.42 S = 1.74 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 11.31 S = 1.69 N = 51	

Table 105. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for community support of education

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 11.00 S = 2.90 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 9.76 S = 3.08 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 8.92 S = 2.62 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 9.95 S = 2.97 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 10.03 S = 3.04 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 10.00 S = 3.22 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 8.88 S = 2.38 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 9.65 S = 2.92 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 10.53 S = 2.98 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 9.87 S = 3.12 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 8.90 S = 2.48 N = 51	

Table 106. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for community pressures

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 13.46 S = 2.31 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 13.13 S = 2.30 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 14.48 S = 1.87 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 13.64 S = 2.23 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 14.07 S = 2.12 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 14.23 S = 1.68 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 14.42 S = 2.24 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 14.23 S = 2.01 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 13.75 S = 2.22 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 13.64 S = 2.09 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 14.45 S = 2.05 N = 51	

Table 107. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 17.26 S = 6.61 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 15.50 S = 5.07 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 15.76 S = 6.62 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 16.20 S = 6.09 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 16.53 S = 5.87 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 18.88 S = 6.04 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 14.84 S = 5.40 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 16.75 S = 5.94 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 16.91 S = 6.22 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 17.07 S = 5.75 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 15.29 S = 5.99 N = 51	

Table 108. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 18.66 S = 3.98 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 19.43 S = 3.66 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 19.04 S = 4.02 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 19.04 S = 3.85 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 19.50 S = 3.98 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 20.30 S = 4.07 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 18.46 S = 3.51 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 19.42 S = 3.89 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.06 S = 3.97 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 19.83 S = 3.85 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 18.74 S = 3.74 N = 51	

Table 109. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 20.66 S = 6.56 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 17.83 S = 5.86 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 18.72 S = 6.55 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 19.09 S = 6.36 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 19.28 S = 5.32 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 21.61 S = 6.97 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 17.50 S = 4.68 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 19.46 S = 5.90 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.00 S = 5.98 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 19.58 S = 6.62 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 18.09 S = 5.65 N = 51	

Table 110. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 20.96 S = 4.25 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 20.43 S = 3.87 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 20.96 S = 4.09 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 20.77 S = 4.03 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 21.28 S = 3.92 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 21.46 S = 4.97 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 20.96 S = 3.50 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 21.23 S = 4.12 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.12 S = 4.06 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 20.91 S = 4.40 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 20.96 S = 3.76 N = 51	

Table 111. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 16.83 S = 6.34 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 16.63 S = 5.23 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 17.76 S = 5.77 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 17.03 S = 5.75 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 17.42 S = 6.25 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 21.46 S = 4.97 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 16.11 S = 5.00 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 17.55 S = 6.08 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 17.12 S = 6.25 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 17.78 S = 6.04 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 16.92 S = 5.40 N = 51	

Table 112. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 18.36 S = 5.23 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 19.56 S = 4.24 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 19.32 S = 4.43 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 19.07 S = 4.64 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 19.28 S = 3.62 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 19.57 S = 4.92 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 18.57 S = 3.71 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 17.55 S = 6.08 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 18.81 S = 4.51 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 19.57 S = 4.53 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 18.94 S = 4.05 N = 51	

Table 113. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 19.93 S = 8.78 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 18.03 S = 6.49 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 18.68 S = 6.93 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 18.89 S = 7.45 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 19.71 S = 6.71 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 20.46 S = 6.26 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 15.61 S = 5.11 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 18.62 S = 6.37 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 19.82 S = 7.78 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 19.16 S = 6.44 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 17.11 S = 6.20 N = 51	

Table 114. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 21.63 S = 5.48 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 21.83 S = 3.90 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 23.08 S = 5.06 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 22.12 S = 4.83 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 21.75 S = 3.80 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 23.07 S = 3.18 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 21.03 S = 3.42 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 21.95 S = 3.54 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 21.68 S = 4.70 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 22.41 S = 3.61 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 22.03 S = 4.38 N = 51	

Table 115. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 21.06 S = 9.50 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 20.43 S = 8.59 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 21.24 S = 8.92 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 20.89 S = 8.92 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 20.67 S = 9.71 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 23.73 S = 7.91 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 16.34 S = 7.24 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 20.26 S = 8.81 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.87 S = 9.52 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 21.96 S = 8.37 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 18.74 S = 8.39 N = 51	

Table 116. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 24.33 S = 5.85 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 24.93 S = 5.15 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 26.68 S = 4.77 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 25.23 S = 5.33 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 25.64 S = 3.70 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 26.46 S = 4.65 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 23.26 S = 5.31 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 25.13 S = 4.72 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 24.96 S = 4.93 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 25.64 S = 4.94 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 24.94 S = 5.29 N = 51	

Table 117. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 16.26 S = 7.97 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 14.96 S = 7.75 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 16.48 S = 9.20 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 15.87 S = 8.20 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 17.42 S = 7.73 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 19.15 S = 7.86 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 12.19 S = 4.56 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 16.28 S = 7.43 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 16.82 S = 7.81 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 16.91 S = 8.01 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 14.29 S = 7.46 N = 51	

Table 118. Descriptive presentation of the data for student class and sex category for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

Sex	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Sex descriptors
Male	$\bar{X}$ = 20.53 S = 4.31 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 21.70 S = 4.80 N = 30	$\bar{X}$ = 21.04 S = 5.58 N = 25	$\bar{X}$ = 21.09 S = 4.85 N = 85
Female	$\bar{X}$ = 20.89 S = 4.32 N = 28	$\bar{X}$ = 22.69 S = 3.73 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 19.61 S = 5.08 N = 26	$\bar{X}$ = 21.06 S = 4.53 N = 80
Class descriptors	$\bar{X}$ = 20.70 S = 4.28 N = 58	$\bar{X}$ = 22.16 S = 4.33 N = 56	$\bar{X}$ = 20.31 S = 5.33 N = 51	

Table 119. Analysis of variance between parent groups as measured by the total education scale

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP[a]	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	71.88	5.02	0.58	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	70.87	5.18							
Post high parents	27	71.59	4.97							
Junior high parents	43	70.60	6.20							

[a]PVP/PSVP = previsit parents--post visit parents comparison
PVP/PHP = previsit parents--post high parents comparison
PVP/JHP = previsit parents--junior high parents comparison
PSVP/PHP = post visit parents-post high parents comparison
PSVP/JHP = post visit parents-junior high parents comparison
PHP/JHP = post high parents-junior high parents comparison.

Table 120. Analysis of variance between parent groups on curriculum issues

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	11.16	1.25	1.47	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	11.30	1.17							
Post high parents	27	10.96	1.48							
Junior high parents	43	10.76	1.91							

Table 121. Analysis of variance between parent groups on community support of education

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	7.58	2.37	1.01	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	7.64	2.44							
Post high parents	27	6.88	2.10							
Junior high parents	43	7.11	2.32							

Table 122. Analysis of variance between parent groups on community pressures

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	15.12	2.42	0.96	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	15.53	1.91							
Post high parents	27	15.51	1.67							
Junior high parents	43	14.90	2.63							

Table 123. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	12.58	3.89	2.93	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	14.69	5.46							
Post high parents	27	12.25	4.11							
Junior high parents	43	14.23	5.18							

Table 124. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	18.90	3.50	0.62	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	19.27	4.09							
Post high parents	27	18.03	3.95							
Junior high parents	43	18.93	4.60							

Table 125. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	14.90	3.72	1.21	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	16.43	5.19							
Post high parents	27	15.44	4.11							
Junior high parents	43	15.39	5.13							

Table 126. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	20.76	3.10	1.85	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	20.95	3.89							
Post high parents	27	20.85	3.55							
Junior high parents	43	19.41	3.65							

Table 127. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	15.86	3.95	1.03	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	16.39	5.33							
Post high parents	27	14.74	3.79							
Junior high parents	43	16.69	5.62							

Table 128. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	20.12	3.93	0.41	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	19.58	4.43							
Post high parents	27	19.07	4.19							
Junior high parents	43	19.88	3.94							

Table 129. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept parents of Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F--value	Scheffe Test F--value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	16.28	4.43	0.40	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	16.14	4.72							
Post high parents	27	15.44	3.82							
Junior high parents	43	16.72	5.63							

Table 130. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept parents of Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	21.62	4.08	1.42	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	22.48	4.73							
Post high parents	27	22.18	4.02							
Junior high parents	43	20.83	4.22							

Table 131. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	15.28	4.96	1.00	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	16.46	8.06							
Post high parents	27	18.00	6.15							
Junior high parents	43	16.79	6.17							

Table 132. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	23.30	4.50	1.36	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	24.29	5.31							
Post high parents	27	24.59	3.71							
Junior high parents	43	22.76	4.74							

Table 133. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	13.48	4.07	1.48	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	15.12	6.09							
Post high parents	27	13.62	4.15							
Junior high parents	43	15.11	5.11							

Table 134. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value PVP/PSVP	PVP/PHP	PVP/JHP	PSVP/PHP	PSVP/JHP	PHP/JHP
Previsit parents	50	20.38	4.62	0.83	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	21.46	4.13							
Post high parents	27	20.48	4.01							
Junior high parents	43	20.72	4.25							

Table 135. Analysis of variance between parent groups as measured by the total education scale

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP[a]	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	71.26	5.13	0.35	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	71.59	5.97				
Junior high parents	43	70.60	6.20				

[a]HSP/PHP = high school parents-post high parents comparison
HSP/JHP = high school parents-junior high parents comparison
PHP/JHP = post high parents-junior high parents comparison.

Table 136. Analysis of variance between parent groups on curriculum issues

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	11.25	1.20	2.05	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	10.96	1.48				
Junior high parents	43	10.76	1.91				

Table 137. Analysis of variance between parent groups on community support of education

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	7.61	2.40	1.51	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	6.88	2.10				
Junior high parents	43	7.11	2.32				

Table 138. Analysis of variance between parent groups on community pressures

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	15.37	2.12	0.89	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	15.51	1.67				
Junior high parents	43	14.90	2.63				

Table 139. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	13.88	5.01	1.48	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	12.25	4.11				
Junior high parents	43	14.23	5.18				

Table 140. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	19.13	3.86	0.81	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	18.03	3.95				
Junior high parents	43	4.60					

Table 141. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	15.84	4.73	0.19	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	15.44	4.11				
Junior high parents	43	15.39	5.13				

Table 142. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	20.87	3.60	2.75	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	20.85	3.55				
Junior high parents	43	19.41	3.65				

Table 143. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	16.19	4.84	1.38	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	14.74	3.79				
Junior high parents	43	16.69	5.63				

Table 144. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	19.78	4.24	0.37	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	19.07	4.19				
Junior high parents	43	19.88	3.94				

Table 145. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	16.19	4.59	0.60	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	15.44	3.82				
Junior high parents	43	16.72	5.63				

Table 146. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	22.15	4.49	1.54	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	22.18	4.02				
Junior high parents	43	20.83	4.22				

Table 147. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	16.01	7.04	1.03	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	18.00	6.15				
Junior high parents	43	16.79	6.17				

Table 148. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	23.91	5.02	1.38	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	24.59	3.71				
Junior high parents	43	22.76	4.74				

Table 149. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	14.49	5.45	0.67	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	13.63	4.15				
Junior high parents	43	15.11	5.11				

Table 150. Analysis of variance between parent groups for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	PHP/JHP
High school parents	131	21.05	4.34	0.25	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post high parents	27	20.48	4.01				
Junior high parents	43	20.72	4.25				

Table 151. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students as measured by the total education scale

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP[a]	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	73.01	5.15	7.47**	n.s.	n.s.	10.39**	n.s.	3.11*	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	71.88	5.02							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	70.98	5.74							
Students	165	69.65	5.69							

[a]T/PVP = teachers-previsit parents comparison
T/PNHSS = teachers-parents of nonhigh school students comparison
T/S = teachers-students comparison
PVP/PNHSS = previsit parents-parents of nonhigh school students comparison
PVP/S = previsit parents-students comparison
PNHSS/S = parents of nonhigh school students-students comparison.

Table 152. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students on curriculum issues

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	10.79	1.23	4.41**	n.s.	n.s.	4.93**	n.s.	n.s.	3.78**
Previsit parents	50	11.16	1.25							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	10.84	1.74							
Students	165	11.44	1.64							

Table 153. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students on community support of education

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	7.23	2.22	29.99**	n.s.	n.s.	27.40**	n.s.	14.18**	28.41**
Previsit parents	50	7.58	2.37							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	7.02	2.22							
Students	165	9.80	2.94							

Table 154. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students on community pressures

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	15.97	1.76	18.44**	n.s.	2.90*	25.48**	n.s.	5.91**	7.91**
Previsit parents	50	15.12	2.43							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	15.14	2.31							
Students	165	13.93	2.14							

Table 155. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	12.88	4.80	13.27**	n.s.	n.s.	12.82**	n.s.	10.37**	7.93**
Previsit parents	50	12.58	3.89							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	13.47	4.86							
Students	165	16.46	6.01							

Table 156. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	18.15	3.36	1.59	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	18.90	3.50							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	18.58	4.35							
Students	165	19.23	3.86							

Table 157. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	14.32	3.88	23.21**	n.s.	n.s.	25.93**	n.s.	13.92**	13.95**
Previsit parents	50	14.90	3.72							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	15.41	4.73							
Students	165	19.27	6.12							

Table 158. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	20.76	3.14	1.29	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	20.76	3.10							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	19.97	3.65							
Students	165	21.00	4.07							

Table 159. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	18.23	5.08	3.32*	3.10*	3.53*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	15.86	3.95							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	15.94	5.06							
Students	165	17.28	5.90							

Table 160. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	20.70	4.39	2.79*	n.s.	n.s.	3.90**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	20.12	3.93							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	19.57	4.03							
Students	165	19.10	4.37							

Table 161. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	15.67	4.02	7.19**	n.s.	n.s.	8.13**	n.s.	3.62*	4.86**
Previsit parents	50	16.28	4.43							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	16.22	5.02							
Students	165	18.76	6.93							

Table 162. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.54	0.79	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	21.62	4.08							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	21.35	4.17							
Students	165	22.04	4.24							

Table 163. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	14.39	5.00	16.85**	n.s.	3.06*	20.88**	n.s.	10.55**	5.35**
Previsit parents	50	15.28	4.96							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	17.25	6.15							
Students	165	20.58	8.84							

Table 164. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.77	13.40**	2.87*	4.15*	19.70**	n.s.	4.37**	3.46*
Previsit parents	50	23.30	4.50							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	23.47	4.43							
Students	165	25.18	5.03							

Table 165. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	13.45	3.81	4.55**	n.s.	n.s.	5.13**	n.s.	3.45*	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	13.48	4.07							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	14.54	4.79							
Students	165	16.07	7.82							

Table 166. Analysis of variance between teachers, previsit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PVP/PNHSS	PVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	20.09	3.94	1.02	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Previsit parents	50	20.38	4.62							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	20.62	4.13							
Students	165	21.07	4.68							

Table 167. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students as measured by the total education scale

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP[a]	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	73.01	5.15	6.95**	3.11*	n.s.	10.42**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	70.87	5.18							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	70.98	5.74							
Students	165	69.65	5.69							

[a]T/PSVP = teachers-post visit parents comparison
T/PNHSS = teachers-parents of nonhigh school students comparison
T/S = teachers-students comparison
PSVP/PNHSS = post visit parents-parents of nonhigh school students comparison
PSVP/S = post visit parents-students comparison
PNHSS/S = parents of nonhigh school students-students comparison.

Table 168. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students on curriculum issues

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	10.79	1.23	4.86**	n.s.	n.s.	5.14**	n.s.	n.s.	3.94**
Post visit parents	81	11.30	1.17							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	10.84	1.75							
Students	165	11.44	1.64							

Table 169. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students on community support of education

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	7.23	2.22	30.66**	n.s.	n.s.	27.50**	n.s.	19.09**	28.49**
Post visit parents	81	7.64	2.44							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	7.02	2.22							
Students	165	9.80	2.94							

Table 170. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students on community pressures

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	15.97	1.76	22.65**	n.s.	3.13*	27.53**	n.s.	16.49**	8.56**
Post visit parents	81	15.53	1.91							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	15.14	2.31							
Students	165	13.93	2.14							

Table 171. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	12.88	4.80	9.91**	n.s.	n.s.	11.98**	n.s.	2.87*	7.41**
Post visit parents	81	14.69	5.46							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	13.47	4.86							
Students	165	16.46	6.01							

Table 172. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	18.15	3.36	1.81	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	19.27	4.09							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	18.58	4.35							
Students	165	19.23	3.86							

Table 173. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	14.32	3.88	19.66**	3.27*	n.s.	24.39**	n.s.	7.85**	13.12**
Post visit parents	81	16.43	5.19							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	15.41	4.73							
Students	165	19.27	6.12							

Table 174. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	20.76	3.14	1.30	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	20.95	3.89							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	19.97	3.65							
Students	165	21.00	4.07							

Table 175. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	18.23	5.08	2.75*	n.s.	3.35*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	16.39	5.33							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	15.94	5.06							
Students	165	17.28	5.90							

Table 176. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	20.70	4.39	2.51	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	19.58	4.43							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	19.57	4.03							
Students	165	19.10	4.37							

Table 177. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	15.67	4.02	7.78**	n.s.	n.s.	8.25**	n.s.	5.80**	4.93**
Post visit parents	81	16.14	4.72							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	16.22	5.02							
Students	165	18.76	6.93							

Table 178. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.54	1.47	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	22.48	4.73							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	21.35	4.17							
Students	165	22.04	4.24							

Table 179. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	14.39	5.00	14.04**	n.s.	n.s.	18.67**	n.s.	8.07**	4.78**
Post visit parents	81	16.46	8.06							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	17.25	6.15							
Students	165	20.58	8.84							

Table 180. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.77	12.56**	8.02**	3.87**	18.35**	n.s.	8.07**	4.78**
Post visit parents	81	24.29	5.31							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	23.47	4.43							
Students	165	25.18	5.03							

Table 181. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	13.45	3.81	3.38*	n.s.	n.s.	4.80**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	15.12	6.09							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	14.54	4.79							
Students	165	16.07	7.82							

Table 182. Analysis of variance between teachers, post visit parents, parents of nonhigh school students and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value					
					T/PSVP	T/PNHSS	T/S	PSVP/PNHSS	PSVP/S	PNHSS/S
Teachers	84	20.09	3.94	1.61	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Post visit parents	81	21.46	4.13							
Parents of nonhigh school students	70	20.62	4.13							
Students	165	21.07	4.68							

Table 183. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students as measured by the total education scale

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP[a]	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	73.01	5.15	5.59**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	7.06**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	71.26	5.13											
Post high parents	27	71.59	4.97											
Junior high parents	43	70.60	6.20											
Students	165	69.65	5.69											

[a] T/HSP = teachers-high school parents comparison
T/PHP = teachers-post high parents comparison
T/JHP = teachers-parents of junior high students
T/S = teachers-students comparison
HSP/PHP = high school parents-post high parents comparison
HSP/JHP = high school parents-junior high parents comparison
HSP/S = high school parents-students comparison
PHP/JHP = post high parents-junior high parents comparison
PHP/S = post high parents-students comparison
JHP/S = junior high parents-students comparison.

Table 184. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students on curriculum issues

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	10.79	1.23	3.77**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	3.54**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	11.25	1.20											
Post high parents	27	10.96	1.48											
Junior high parents	43	10.76	1.91											
Students	165	11.44	1.64											

Table 185. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students on community support of education

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	7.23	2.22	24.42**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	18.66**	n.s.	n.s.	17.82**	n.s.	10.02**	12.55**
High school parents	131	7.61	2.40											
Post high parents	27	6.88	2.10											
Junior high parents	43	7.11	2.32											
Students	165	9.80	2.94											

Table 186. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students on community pressures

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	15.97	1.76	16.47**	n.s.	n.s.	2.45*	17.61**	n.s.	n.s.	11.53**	n.s.	4.41**	2.45*
High school parents	131	15.37	2.12											
Post high parents	27	15.51	1.67											
Junior high parents	43	14.90	2.63											
Students	165	13.93	2.14											

Table 187. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	12.88	4.80	9.15**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	8.40**	n.s.	n.s.	5.73**	n.s.	4.81**	n.s.
High school parents	131	13.88	5.01											
Post high parents	27	12.25	4.11											
Junior high parents	43	14.23	5.18											
Students	165	16.46	6.01											

Table 188. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	18.15	3.36	1.54	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	19.13	3.86											
Post high parents	27	18.03	3.95											
Junior high parents	43	18.93	4.60											
Students	165	19.23	3.86											

Table 189. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	14.32	3.88	16.65**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	17.11**	n.s.	n.s.	10.78**	n.s.	4.25**	6.43**
High school parents	131	15.84	4.73											
Post high parents	27	15.44	4.11											
Junior high parents	43	15.39	5.13											
Students	165	19.27	6.12											

Table 190. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	20.76	3.14	1.62	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	20.87	3.60											
Post high parents	27	20.85	3.55											
Junior high parents	43	19.41	3.65											
Students	165	21.00	4.07											

Table 191. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	18.23	5.08	3.24*	2.52*	2.93*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	16.19	4.84											
Post high parents	27	14.74	3.79											
Junior high parents	43	16.69	5.63											
Students	165	17.28	5.90											

Table 192. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	20.70	4.39	2.10	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	19.78	4.24											
Post high parents	27	19.07	4.19											
Junior high parents	43	19.88	3.94											
Students	165	19.10	4.37											

Table 193. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential.

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	15.67	4.02	6.59**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	5.76**	n.s.	n.s.	5.24**	n.s.	2.77*	n.s.
High school parents	131	16.19	4.59											
Post high parents	27	15.44	3.82											
Junior high parents	43	16.72	5.63											
Students	165	18.76	6.93											

Table 194. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.54	1.25	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	22.15	4.49											
Post high parents	27	22.18	4.02											
Junior high parents	43	20.83	4.22											
Students	165	22.04	4.24											

Table 195. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	14.39	5.00	12.52**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	13.27**	n.s.	n.s.	9.51**	n.s.	n.s.	3.05*
High school parents	131	16.01	7.04											
Post high parents	27	18.00	6.15											
Junior high parents	43	16.79	6.17											
Students	165	20.58	8.84											

Table 196. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.77	10.01**	5.11**	8.14**	n.s.	12.40**	n.s.	n.s.	83.72**	n.s.	n.s.	2.99*
High school parents	131	23.91	5.02											
Post high parents	27	24.59	3.71											
Junior high parents	43	22.76	4.74											
Students	165	25.18	5.03											

Table 197. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	13.45	3.81	3.13*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	3.41**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	14.49	5.45											
Post high parents	27	13.63	4.15											
Junior high parents	43	15.11	5.11											
Students	165	16.07	7.82											

Table 198. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents of high school students, parents of post high school students, parents of junior high school students and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	S.D.	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value									
					T/HSP	T/PHP	T/JHP	T/S	HSP/PHP	HSP/JHP	HSP/S	PHP/JHP	PHP/S	JHP/S
Teachers	84	20.09	3.94	0.86	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
High school parents	131	21.05	4.34											
Post high parents	27	20.48	4.01											
Junior high parents	43	20.72	4.25											
Students	165	21.07	4.68											

Table 199. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students as measured by the total education scale

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P[a]	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	73.01	5.15	10.89**	6.86**	21.26**	7.05**
Parents	201	71.16	5.34				
Students	165	69.65	5.69				

[a]T/P = teacher-parent comparison
T/S = teacher-student comparison
P/S = parent-student comparison.

Table 200. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students on curriculum issues

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	10.79	1.23	5.62**	n.s.	10.60**	4.65*
Parents	201	11.10	1.42				
Students	165	11.44	1.64				

Table 201. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students on community support of education

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	7.23	2.22	47.52**	n.s.	55.93**	79.75**
Parents	201	7.41	2.35				
Students	165	9.80	2.94				

Table 202. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students on community pressures

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	15.97	1.76	31.97**	6.27**	52.83**	38.50**
Parents	201	15.29	2.19				
Students	165	13.93	2.14				

Table 203. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	12.88	4.80	17.01**	n.s.	25.17**	23.89**
Parents	201	13.74	4.95				
Students	165	16.46	6.01				

Table 204. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	18.16	3.36	2.18	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents	201	18.94	4.04				
Students	165	19.23	3.86				

Table 205. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	14.32	3.88	33.26**	4.23*	51.53**	44.14**
Parents	201	15.69	4.72				
Students	165	19.27	6.12				

Table 206. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept students at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	20.76	3.14	0.63	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents	201	20.56	3.63				
Students	165	21.00	4.07				

Table 207. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept education in America as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	18.23	5.08	5.31**	9.54**	n.s.	4.50*
Parents	201	16.10	4.91				
Students	165	17.28	5.90				

Table 208. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept education in America as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	20.70	4.39	3.86*	3.18*	7.72**	n.s.
Parents	201	19.71	4.16				
Students	165	19.10	4.37				

Table 209. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	15.67	4.02	12.78**	n.s.	17.32**	19.52**
Parents	201	16.20	4.73				
Students	165	18.76	6.93				

Table 210. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept parents of Mason City High School students as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.54	0.82	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents	201	21.87	4.39				
Students	165	22.04	4.24				

Table 211. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	14.39	5.00	24.18**	4.67**	39.83**	29.21**
Parents	201	16.44	6.76				
Students	165	20.58	8.84				

Table 212. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept teacher home visits as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	21.33	3.77	18.54**	15.70**	37.15**	301.70**
Parents	201	23.76	4.82				
Students	165	25.18	5.03				

Table 213. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the evaluative scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	13.45	3.81	5.79**	n.s.	10.27**	5.98**
Parents	201	14.51	5.22				
Students	165	16.07	7.82				

Table 214. Analysis of variance between teachers, parents and students for the concept teachers at Mason City High School as measured by the potency scale of the semantic differential

	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOV F-value	Scheffe Test F-value T/P	T/S	P/S
Teachers	84	20.09	3.94	1.49	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Parents	201	20.90	4.26				
Students	165	21.07	4.68				